The Inevitability of the Clash of Civilisations *(Hatmiyyat Sira'a ul-Hadharat)*

Hizb ut-Tahrir

Safar 1423 Hijri
(May 2002 CE)

Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB
e-mail: info@1924.org
website: http://www.1924.org

Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB
e-mail: info@1924.org
website: http://www.1924.org

Safar 1423 Hijri
(May 2002 CE)

ISBN 1 899 574 28 X

Translation of the Qur'an

It should be clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an' throughout the book.

Qur'anic *ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised*.

Ahadith appear in **bold**.

ﷻ - subhanahu wa ta'ala
ﷺ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam
ﷺ - radhi allaho anha/anho
AH - After Hijrah
CE - Christian Era

Contents

1 **The Meaning of Civilisation (*Hadhara*) 4**

2 **The Meaning of Dialogue (*Al-Hiwar*) Between Civilisations 8**

3 **The Idea of Equality Between Civilisations 16**

4 **The Idea of Accepting the Other 19**

5 **The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation 27**

6 **The Clash Between Civilisations 29**

7 **Forms of the Clash of Civilisation 42**

8 **Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those denying the Offensive Jihad (*Jihad ut-Talab*) 61**

9 **Conclusion 67**

1
The Meaning of Civilisation (Hadhara)

A civilisation (*hadhara*) is a collection of concepts about life; it can be divine - from god - or it can be from man. The divine civilisation emanates from a doctrine (*'aqeedah*); for example, the Islamic civilisation emanates from the Islamic *'aqeedah*. The man-made civilisation may emanate from a doctrine or it may not. The western capitalist civilisation is a collection of concepts about life emanating from the doctrine of separating religion from life. Conversely, the Shinto, Greek, Babylonian and Assyrian civilisations do not emanate from a doctrine. This type of civilisation is simply a collection of concepts that a people or a group of peoples have agreed upon, it is called a man-made, or national, civilisation.

It is possible for a people or peoples to have a religion (*deen*) and a doctrine, but for the religion to have no concepts regarding life; this is the case with the religions like Christianity and Buddhism. Because their doctrine doesn't produce these concepts, people instead agree on a set of concepts about life that are specific to them and these concepts form their civilisation. This civilisation does not have any relationship with their religion because it does not emanate from it. So their civilisation is not a divine one, despite the fact that they have a religion. Hence, it is possible for various peoples to associate in one civilisation, despite the difference of their religions like the Japanese, Hindus, Sikhs and French; their religions are different but their civilisation is one, namely capitalism.

Material objects that are used in life's affairs are not part of civilisation, even though they sometimes result from it. There is nothing wrong with giving the technical term, *'madaniyya'* to these tangible material objects, so as to distinguish them from the collection of concepts for which we used the term, *'hadhara'* (civilisation). If these material objects resulted from - and are specific to - a particular civilisation, like statues for example, then they are part of the specific *madaniyya*. However, if they

resulted from science and industry; like television, rockets, planes and penicillin for example, then they are from the universal *madaniyya*. So *madaniyya* can be specific, and it can be universal. The nature of the *madaniyya* is different to the nature of civilisation, in that civilisation cannot be anything but specific. The meaning of specificity is related to our [the Muslims'] adoption. So it is not permitted for us to adopt that which is specific, whereas it is permitted for us to adopt anything that is universal.

The distinction between civilisation (*hadhara*) and *madaniyya* must be observed at all times, similarly it is imperative to distinguish between the *madaniyya* that is derived from civilisation and the *madaniyya* that is derived from science and industry. This is in order to observe the distinction between the types of objects when adopting *madaniyya*. There is nothing wrong with adopting the western *madaniyya* that is derived from science and industry. As for the western *madaniyya* that is derived from the western civilisation; it is not permitted to adopt it in absolutely any case. This is because its doctrine (*'aqeedah*) contradicts the Islamic civilisation, and this doctrine is the basis upon which it is built. Our doctrine is different from their doctrine (which is built upon a compromise solution and the separation of religion from life) in its outlook on life (ie criterion for actions), which is the *halal* and *haram* for us, and benefit for them. Our doctrine is also different in what it means by happiness (ie permanent tranquillity), which is attaining the pleasure of Allah for us, and attaining the bodily pleasures for them.

In order that we become fully aware of what we adopt from others and what we leave, it is necessary to distinguish between civilisation and the *madaniyya*, and between the *madaniyya* that results from civilisational concepts and the *madaniyya* that results from pure sciences and industry.

If it is said; "Why did you adopt the term, *'hadhara'* for concepts and the term, *'madaniyya'* for the material objects instead of the reverse?" The response to this is; the linguistic meaning of, *'hadhara'* is to reside in a civilised region (like a town), while *'al-hadhir'* is the one who is from the town or village. Al-Qatami said; "Whoever is pleased with residing in towns. Which Bedouin men will see us?"

To, *'madana'* in a place means to reside therein, and *'madina'* means to

arrive to the town (*madinah*), so the two meanings are close to each other. Similarly it is said [concerning *hadhara*] in response to our self-directed question; *hadhara* is used linguistically for meanings related to thoughts, so it is more appropriate to use it for describing concepts. It was said in *Al-Qamus*; "*Hadhura* is like *nadusa*, which is the man of eloquence, (*bayan*) and understanding (*fiqh*)." In *Al-Lisan*, it is said; "a man [is] *'hadhr'*, to mean he is eloquent, and a man *'hadhir'* if he brought something good." It also came in *Al-Lisan*; "and in the hadith; '**Say that which *yahdhurukum***', ie that which is present and existing in you, and do not burden yourselves with something else." So *hadhara* is closer in meaning, more consistent and more appropriate to use as the term for the collection of concepts than *madaniyya* is. Similarly *madaniyya* is closer in its meaning and more suitable to be used as the term for the material objects. It can been said that there isn't any disputation with regards to technical terminology (*istilah*), since what is important is distinguishing between the concepts and the material objects derived from them, and between these objects and those derived from pure sciences, inventions and industry. The objects that are derived from concepts are rejected and it is not permitted to take them, while it is permitted to take the ones that are not derived from the concepts.

We have said that the civilisation (*hadhara*) is a collection of concepts about life, and that either it is a divine civilisation or a man-made civilisation. An example of the divine civilisation is the Islamic civilisation, and an example of the man-made civilisation is the Indian civilisation and the western civilisation. The existence of these civilisations is a definite matter and an incontestable established fact. Similarly, the difference between them is an established fact; such that nobody but the liar can deny it. The source of the divine civilisation, according to its people, is revelation; whilst the source of the man-made civilisation is the people who agreed upon it. This alone is enough to show the distinction and difference. Even if there appears to be a similarity in some of their concepts, it is not actually an agreement, similarity or common matter. This is because civilisation, when it is adopted, must be adopted together with the basis from which it emanated, or the basis upon which it is built. So if the bases of the two civilisations are different, the agreement between some of their concepts, or the existence of a similarity between some of their concepts about life, is not worth paying any attention to. This is because the concept is a branch from its basis, and it cannot be

adopted except with its basis. Both the Islamic civilisation and the western civilisation allow the eating of fish, the wearing of wool, private property, women to act as represenatives, accounting the ruler and taking medicine. However, these ideas and their like are not considered to be from the Islamic civilisation unless they are adopted on the basis of the revelation from Allah to Muhammad ﷺ (ie upon their being *Shar'a*), whereas in the capitalist civilisation they are adopted on the basis of their benefit (*maslaha*) or rational preference. If the Muslim adopts them based upon benefit or rational preference, it is not considered to be adopting from Islam.

The difference between civilisations is a fact that can't be denied. What concerns us is the difference between the Islamic civilisation and the other civilisations, in particular the western civilisation. We also want to see what results from or is built upon this difference, such as; dialogue [with a view to reconciliation], the clash (*as-sira'a*), the possibility of founding one universal civilisation, the forms and types of clash, and whether the clash will end, be concealed, or result in victory for one civilisation over the others? What is the meaning of dialogue between religions in the eyes of those who call for it, and what is the correct view about it? And what is the difference between religions and civilisations? And there are many issues besides these.

Religions are of two types. Firstly there is the religion from which a civilisation emerges - meaning it has a collection of concepts about life - such as the Islamic *deen*. Secondly, there is also the religion from which no civilisation emerges - and there isn't a collection of concepts [about life] contained in it - this is like the Christian religion. Although it has ideals like, 'do not steal', and, 'do not commit *zina*', it has no collection of concepts covering all aspects of life. Hence, the Christian religion is an appropriate example of a religion from which no civilisation emanates.

The capitalist civilisation does not emanate from the Christian religion; even if it came about in countries where the majority of the people are Christians. So the dialogue, clash, or partnership between Islam and Christianity differs from the dialogue or clash between it and the capitalist civilisation.

2

The Meaning of Dialogue (Al-Hiwar) Between Civilisations

When we speak about dialogue or clash we are speaking about the Muslims, their *deen* and their civilisation being on one side, and the Christians with their religion and the capitalists with their civilisation, being on the other side. It is a malicious attempt by the leaders and intellectuals of the capitalist civilisation to differentiate between Islam and its followers ie between Islam and Muslims. So they claim that Islam is great but that Muslims are backward and some of them are terrorists. They are lying when they propagate this view, since if they really thought that Islam was great then they would have embraced it. However, they attempt to delude the naïve from amongst the Muslims, attempting to reduce the rancour that is generated against them when they strike the Muslims, or when they try to spread the concepts from their civilisation among the Muslims. They know that the Islamic *'aqeedah* still remains in the souls of the Muslims and that it is strong in the majority of them. So if they openly declare their enmity to Islam, they will stir up the Muslims and provoke them. So they use these words as a weapon to anaesthetise Muslims and to deceive them. Some Muslims would swallow this bait and accept this dialogue in the way it is presented by the Christians and capitalists, or promoted by their intellectual agents. They concentrate on three matters in defining dialogue. The first is equality between religions and civilisations in the dialogue without superiority or preference of a religion or civilisation over another. The second is that the limit of the dialogue is restricted to only knowing the other's opinions without addressing these opinions in respect of refutation or invalidation. The third is creating an alternative civilisation through arriving at the common denominators between the two religions and two civilisations.

This is the meaning of dialogue as they see it. They claim that its benefit is; "Productive interaction between cultural peculiarities, to form an alternative, superior civilisation, that invites to accept the other on the

same footing." [Dr Milad Hanna in a cultural debate held in Cairo on Monday 02/04/2001] And; "Every time civilisations seek to find what is common between them and what is human, they advance, flourish, and peace would spread." [Dr. Jafar Abdussalam, the Secretary-General of the Conference of Islamic Universities] One of them went to the extent of saying that; "Islam is a deen of interaction and a deen of development, and not like what is said, that it is a deen of obscurity and a deen of isolation. On the contrary, the golden age of Islam and Muslims was when the Islamic civilisation interacted with other civilisations in the world, and when Islam spread in the world, took from and had a room for all the legacies and other human civilisations and gave them from its legacy and civilisation. This was the golden age of the Islamic State" Dr. Qasim Jafar spoke, in a study circle on 'The First War of the Century', on Al-Jazeera channel, under the heading; 'Are the American explosions an incentive for dialogue or the clash of civilisations?' on 29/9/2001. He said; "It is upon us as Arabs and Muslims to abstain from this problem…it is upon us to possess sufficient confidence in ourselves, in our civilisation, and in our history and legacy, so as to burst forth in the world from the position of equality, and not the position of the follower (*tabi'*)…" [The above-mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera channel] Another said; "The Islamic civilisation was based upon the common denominator between world civilisations, so it accepted the others and interacted with it in taking and giving." [Amr Abdulkarim, a political scientist – IslamOnline.net] Another person attempted to use the *aayaat* of the Noble Qur'an as evidence for the dialogue between civilisations so he said; "And our Book, the Glorious Qur'an, emphasises the manner of dialogue with the others; dialogue with polytheists (*mushrikeen*),

﴿وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَأَجِرْهُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ اللّهِ﴾

"If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah" [TMQ 9: 6], dialogue with disbelievers (*kafireen*),

﴿قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

"O you disbelievers" [TMQ: 109: 1],

dialogue with the current and official religions in the world,

﴿يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْاْ إِلَى كَلَمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلاَّ نَعْبُدَ إِلاَّ اللّهَ وَلاَ نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئاً وَلاَ يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضاً أَرْبَاباً﴾

"Say; O People of the Book, come to a just word between us and you, that we worship none but Allah, that we associate nothing with Him, nor some of us take others as lords" [3: 64]; dialogue with them from a position of equivalence…I view that it is not possible to speak of eternal struggle because we are Muslims. I point to the Qur'anic *ayah*, *"Come to a just word between us and you"*. This *ayah* means that it is allowed for us to have dialogue with Christians; we have dialogue with Jews, and we have dialogue with others. Why [do we have this dialogue]? It is to come to a common word between us; we do not say that we [have] dialogue to [bring them to] our word [our views]." [Ata-Allah Muhajirani, Iranian President adviser for the dialogue of civilisations in the above mentioned study circle of *Al-Jazeera*] There are those who call to dialogue between religions to create common denominators between them, and stay silent about the points of difference, in order to desensitise Muslims to the clash. They call to the saying, 'the sons of Abraham', to strengthen dialogue between the three religions on the basis that those who came with them descend from one father namely Ibrahim (as). Some Muslims use the *aayaat* of the Noble Qur'an that say the Prophets were Muslims as a proof for this, like His ﷻ saying at the tongue of Nuh;

﴿وَأُمِرْتُ لأَنْ أَكُونَ أَوَّلَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ﴾

"And I was commanded to be the first of the Muslims" [TMQ 39: 12], at the tongues of Ibrahim and Ismail;

﴿رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمَيْنِ لَكَ وَمِن ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُّسْلِمَةً﴾

"Our Lord! Make us Muslims to you and of our descendants Muslims to you" [TMQ 2: 128], and about the people of Lut;

﴿فَمَا وَجَدْنَا فِيهَا غَيْرَ بَيْتٍ مِّنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ﴾

"And We did not find therein but one house of Muslims" [TMQ 51: 36], and

at the tongue of the disciples (*hawariyyin*);

﴿وَاشْهَدْ بِأَنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ﴾

"And bear witness that we are Muslims." [TMQ 3: 52] Perhaps there will come those who say that Christians and Jews are Muslims, and we hear those who say that the followers of the three religions are believers even though the Qur'anic texts, which are definitely proven and of definite meaning, are decisive in charging Jews and Christians with disbelief such as His ﷻ saying;

﴿إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَن يُفَرِّقُواْ بَيْنَ اللّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَن يَتَّخِذُواْ بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سَبِيلاً ۞ أُوْلَـئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقّاً وَأَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَاباً مُّهِيناً﴾

"Verily those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messenger and wish to distinguish between Allah and His Messenger and say, 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others', and wish to adopt a way in between. Those are in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment." [TMQ 4: 150-1] And;

﴿لَمْ يَكُنِ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُشْرِكِينَ مُنفَكِّينَ حَتَّى تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْبَيِّنَةُ ۞ رَسُولٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ يَتْلُو صُحُفاً مُّطَهَّرَةً﴾

"Those who disbelieve among the People of the Book and the polytheists were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them clear evidence. A Messenger from Allah reciting pure pages." [TMQ 108: 1-2] And;

﴿قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللّهِ وَاللّهُ شَهِيدٌ عَلَى مَا تَعْمَلُونَ﴾

"Say; O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the aayaat of Allah while

Allah is witness over what you are doing?" [TMQ 3: 98] And;

﴿وَلاَ تَكُونُواْ كَالَّذِينَ تَفَرَّقُواْ وَاخْتَلَفُواْ مِن بَعْدِ مَا جَاءهُمُ الْبَيِّنَاتُ وَأُوْلَـئِكَ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ﴾

"Those who disbelieve of the People of the Book and polytheists do not like that there should descend upon you any good from your Lord. But Allah chooses for His mercy whoever He wills. And Allah is the Owner of great bounty." [TMQ 3: 105] And;

﴿يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللّهِ وَأَنتُمْ تَشْهَدُونَ﴾

"O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the aayaat of Allah while you bear witness?" [TMQ 3: 70] And;

﴿وَبِكُفْرِهِمْ وَقَوْلِهِمْ عَلَى مَرْيَمَ بُهْتَاناً عَظِيماً﴾

"And because of their disbelief and uttering a grave falsehood (buhtan) against Mary." [TMQ 4: 156] And;

"Surely they disbelieve who say, 'Allah is the third of three.'" [TMQ 5: 73] And;

﴿قَاتِلُواْ الَّذِينَ لاَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللّهِ وَلاَ بِالْيَوْمِ الآخِرِ وَلاَ يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلاَ يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُواْ الْكِتَابَ حَتَّى يُعْطُواْ الْجِزْيَةَ عَن يَدٍ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ﴾

"Fight those who believe not in Allah and the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid nor follow the deen of truth among the People of the Book until they pay the jizyah readily and subdued." [TMQ 9: 29] And;

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَخْرَجَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ مِن دِيَارِهِمْ لِأَوَّلِ الْحَشْرِ﴾

"He it is Who drove out those who disbelieve among the People of the Book from their homes at the first gathering." [TMQ 59: 2] So, they are disbelievers (*kuffar*), and they are non-Muslims. It is not permitted to term them Muslims. Islam linguistically means submission and in the technical *Shari'ah* terminology, it means the *deen* that Allah *subhanahu* revealed upon Muhammad ﷺ. If it was permitted to assign the term Islam (with its linguistic meanings) to the previous Prophets (as) and to those who believed in and followed them before the mission of Muhammad ﷺ and before the distortion of their books, it was not permitted to do that after his ﷺ mission. So whoever does not believe in him ﷺ and his message is a *kafir*, and it is not allowed to call him a Muslim or a believer. He *ta'ala* said;

﴿وَقُل لِّلَّذِينَ أُوتُواْ الْكِتَابَ وَالأُمِّيِّينَ أَأَسْلَمْتُمْ فَإِنْ أَسْلَمُواْ فَقَدِ اهْتَدَواْ وَّإِن تَوَلَّوْاْ فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلاَغُ وَاللّهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ﴾

"And say to those given the Book and the illiterate (Arab pagans); do you submit yourselves (in Islam)? If they become Muslims, they are guided, and if they turn away, your duty is only the conveyance. And Allah is Seer of His slaves." [TMQ 3: 20] And he ﷺ said;

((والذي نفس محمد بيده لا يسمع بي أحمد من هذه الأمة يهودي ولا نصراني ثم يموت و لم يؤمن بالذي أرسلت به إلا كان من أصحاب النار))

"By the One in whose hand is Muhammad's soul, none hears of me of this Ummah, Jew or Christian, then dies without believing in what I was sent with except he is of the denizens of the Fire." And ibn Hibban extracted from the hadith of Anas that Caesar wrote to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; "I am a Muslim", and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said when he read the letter;

((كذب عدو الله ليس بمسلم وهوعلى النصرانية))

"The enemy of Allah lied. He is not a Muslim and he is upon

Christianity."

Amr Musa, Secretary-General of the Arab League, made clear that he does not believe that one civilisation is better than another civilisation, and from the meaning of his words the Islamic civilisation is not preferable to the capitalist, Hindu or Jewish civilisations, for he says; "We do not believe that there is a better civilisation", in the exposition of his refutation of the Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi. One of them attempted to use the *aayaat* of *surat Al-Kahf* as an evidence for accepting others as they are, without restriction or condition, and without attempting to pronounce judgments against him; "Religious dialogue is the attempt of the individual encumbered with precedent values, conventions, and beliefs to discover the other (of a different religion) – as he is – and understand him and crystallize a philosophical and unconventional (new and unbiased) view towards him without resorting to pronouncing prejudiced value judgments against him…The advocates of religious dialogue raise the slogan of sincere intention. So he divests himself of all conditions and goals except the desire to understand the other and view him intellectually…The content of dialogue does not, in principle, differ with the story that the Noble Qur'an brought in *Surat Al-Kahf* (*aayaat* 32-42) about the dialogue between two men. Allah gave one of them two gardens of grapes surrounded by palm trees and with crops in the middle, rivers flowing therein; and Allah increased its owner over the other in property and children. The tale reveals that the dialogue took place between the two men without condition or restriction, and the Qur'an brought it with its complete details; despite the inclusion of the *kufr* of one of them in Allah, the other did not interrupt the dialogue because of it. Likewise the Qur'an did not refrain from mentioning the sayings of *kufr*, because in their totality they are able to build and formulate the intellectual examination of the personality disbelieving in Allah *'azza wa jalla*…Religious dialogue differs from comparative religion and religious competition even if these concepts commingle in the literature. Comparative religion is a science meaning study of a religion in comparison with others upon the level of the creed (*'aqeedah*), legislation and ritual worships, and its views about man, the universe and life and the like, of assuming objectivity and the possibility of eliminating prejudice. Whereas religious competition is a process aiming to prove the superiority and distinction of a religion over the other; a matter which is not of course aimed by religious dialogue which a process of

understanding only." [Husam Tammam, researcher and journalist, Egypt, IslamOnline.net, under the title; 'Religious Dialogue: A Human Necessity or world Conspiracy']

These quotations are necessary in order to know what the advocates of religious dialogue intend by this expression, which is their technical terminology. The best thing to guide us to the meaning of this technical terminology is what they themselves say or write, since the linguistic meaning does not benefit us here. From all of these quotations, it is possible to crystallize the meaning of this technical terminology in the following:

Firstly: Equality and equivalence between religions and civilisations, and non-preference between one religion and another or one civilisation and another.

Secondly: Accepting the other as it is and discovering it without pronouncing judgments against it, but rather understanding and recognizing its views without restriction or condition.

Thirdly: The objective of dialogue between civilisations is interaction in order to create an alternative superior civilisation by finding out what is common and good for mankind; a matter that leads to the advancement and flourishing of civilisations, and the spreading of peace. The objective of dialogue between religions is to prevent Islam from entering the arena of the struggle.

All these concepts completely contradict Islam. There is not a single concept from these that has evidence or probable evidence for it. They are not from Islam; rather they are all distortion and deception, and their danger against Islam is certain.

3

The Idea of Equality Between Civilisations

The meaning of equality between religions and between civilisations is a *kufr* concept since it is an invitation to equality between the truth and falsehood, between the *deen* of truth and the distorted religions, between *kufr* and *iman*, between misguidance and guidance, and between the abrogating *deen* and the abrogated *deen*; between civilisational concepts whose source is revelation and civilisational concepts laid down by man (ie between the mind and text); between referring to *At-Taghut* and referring to the Book and *Sunnah* (and what they indicated), for judgement; between what is enduring, persistent in the earth, and beneficial to mankind; and the vanishing foam that is like the scum on the sea. The evidences for this idea [of the lack of equality between religions and civilisations] are almost countless. He *ta'ala* said;

﴿بَلْ نَقْذِفُ بِالْحَقِّ عَلَى الْبَاطِلِ فَيَدْمَغُهُ فَإِذَا هُوَ زَاهِقٌ﴾

"Nay We fling the truth (haqq) against the falsehood (batil) so it destroys it. And, behold, it is vanished!" [TMQ 21: 18] And He said;

﴿فَمَاذَا بَعْدَ الْحَقِّ إِلاَّ الضَّلاَلُ﴾

"What is there after the truth except misguidance?" [TMQ 10: 32] And He said;

﴿أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ يَزْعُمُونَ أَنَّهُمْ آمَنُواْ بِمَا أُنزِلَ إِلَيْكَ وَمَا أُنزِلَ مِن قَبْلِكَ يُرِيدُونَ أَن يَتَحَاكَمُواْ إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُواْ أَن يَكْفُرُواْ بِهِ وَيُرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ أَن يُضِلَّهُمْ ضَلاَلاً بَعِيداً﴾

"They wish to arbitrate to At-Taghut while they have been commanded to deny it. And Satan wishes to mislead them far astray!" [TMQ 4: 60] And He said;

﴿هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَى وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ﴾

"He is the One who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the deen of truth so that it prevails over all other deens, even if the polytheists detest it!" [TMQ 9: 33] And He said;

﴿وَمَن يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الإِسْلاَمِ دِيناً فَلَن يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الآخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ﴾

"And whoever seeks other than Islam as a deen, never will it be accepted from him. And in the Hereafter he will be among the losers." [TMQ 3: 85] And He said;

﴿وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقاً لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمُهَيْمِناً عَلَيْهِ﴾

"And We revealed to you the Book in truth confirming the Scripture that came before it and dominating over it." [TMQ 5: 48] And He said;

﴿كَذَلِكَ يَضْرِبُ اللّهُ الْحَقَّ وَالْبَاطِلَ فَأَمَّا الزَّبَدُ فَيَذْهَبُ جُفَاء وَأَمَّا مَا يَنفَعُ النَّاسَ فَيَمْكُثُ فِي الأَرْضِ كَذَلِكَ يَضْرِبُ اللّهُ الأَمْثَالَ﴾

"Thus does Allah show forth truth from falsehood (by parables). Then as for the foam, it passes away as scum while that which benefits mankind remains in the earth. Thus Allah sets forth parables." [TMQ 13: 17] And He said;

﴿فَمَن كَانَ مُؤْمِناً كَمَن كَانَ فَاسِقاً لَّا يَسْتَوُونَ﴾

"Is then he who is a believer like he who is a transgressor (fasiq)? They are not equal." [TMQ 32: 18] And He said;

﴿قُل لاَّ يَسْتَوِي الْخَبِيثُ وَالطَّيِّبُ وَلَوْ أَعْجَبَكَ كَثْرَةُ الْخَبِيثِ فَاتَّقُواْ اللّهَ يَا أُوْلِي الأَلْبَابِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ﴾

"Say; not equal are the evil and the good, even though the abundance of evil pleases you. Fear Allah, O men of understanding, so that you may be successful." [TMQ 5: 100] And He said;

﴿مَثَلُ الْفَرِيقَيْنِ كَالأَعْمَى وَالأَصَمِّ وَالْبَصِيرِ وَالسَّمِيعِ هَلْ يَسْتَوِيَانِ مَثَلاً أَفَلاَ تَذَكَّرُونَ﴾

"The likeness of the two parties is as the blind and deaf, and the seer and hearer. Are the two equal when compared? Will you not then take heed?" [TMQ 11: 24] And He said;

﴿وَدُّواْ لَوْ تَكْفُرُونَ كَمَا كَفَرُواْ فَتَكُونُونَ سَوَاء﴾

"They wish you disbelieve as they disbelieved so that you become equal." [TMQ 4: 89]

How strange it is for the one claiming Islam, that he creates equality between Islam and *kufr*, between atheism, trinity and *tawheed*; between the one who denies the prophethood of Muhammad ﷺ and the one who believes in it; between permitting *riba* and forbidding it; between the worship of Allah *subhanahu* and worshipping creatures; between fornication and marriage; between permitting homosexuality and forbidding lesbianism and homosexuality, and between the pig and the dates. Stranger still is the one who remains silent and says nothing about preference, and does not prefer *tawheed* to polytheism; *halal* to *haram*; the *Shar'a* to *At-Taghut*; the believer to the *kafir*; revelation to man-made legislation, Islam to the remaining religions, the Qur'an to the distorted Books, worshipping The Creator to worshipping the sun, the cow and the stars. May Allah save us from *fitnah*! Subordination is rejected, equality is rejected, and remaining silent about the preference of Islam and its civilisation over the remaining religions and civilisations is rejected.

4
The Idea of Accepting the Other

As for accepting the other, in order to merely know his opinions, without pronouncing any judgments against him, and without refuting what he says; this is not related to the Islamic method in any way. Rather, what the Book indicates is completely contradictory to that. When the Noble Qur'an mentions the thoughts and statements of *kufr*, it always follows them with what is the truth, thus refuting them. There are many examples of this;

﴿وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ الرَّحْمَنُ وَلَداً لَقَدْ جِئْتُمْ شَيْئاً إِدّاً تَكَادُ السَّمَاوَاتُ يَتَفَطَّرْنَ مِنْهُ وَتَنشَقُّ الْأَرْضُ وَتَخِرُّ الْجِبَالُ هَدّاً أَن دَعَوْا لِلرَّحْمَنِ وَلَداً وَمَا يَنبَغِي لِلرَّحْمَنِ أَن يَتَّخِذَ وَلَداً﴾

"They say; 'Ar-Rahmaan has begotten a child.' Indeed you have brought forth a terrible evil thing! Whereby the heavens are almost torn down, the earth split asunder and the mountains fall in ruin. They ascribe a child to Ar-Rahmaan. And it is not suitable for Ar-Rahmaan to beget a child." [TMQ 19: 88-92] And;

﴿وَيَقُولُونَ مَتَى هَذَا الْوَعْدُ إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ لَوْ يَعْلَمُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا حِينَ لَا يَكُفُّونَ عَن وُجُوهِهِمُ النَّارَ وَلَا عَن ظُهُورِهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يُنصَرُونَ بَلْ تَأْتِيهِم بَغْتَةً فَتَبْهَتُهُمْ فَلَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ رَدَّهَا وَلَا هُمْ يُنظَرُونَ﴾

"And they say; 'When will this promise (come to pass), if you are truthful?' If only those who disbelieved knew when they will not be able to ward off the fire from their faces nor their backs. Nor will they be helped. Nay, it will come upon them suddenly

and perplex them. And they will have no power to avert it nor will they get respite." [TMQ 21: 38-40] And;

﴿وَإِذْ قُلْتُمْ يَا مُوسَى لَن نُّؤْمِنَ لَكَ حَتَّى نَرَى اللَّهَ جَهْرَةً فَأَخَذَتْكُمُ الصَّاعِقَةُ وَأَنتُمْ تَنظُرُونَ﴾

"And when you said; 'O Musa, we shall never believe in you until we see Allah plainly.' And you were seized with a thunder bolt while you were looking." [TMQ 2: 55] And;

﴿وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ آمِنُواْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللّهُ قَالُواْ نُؤْمِنُ بِمَا أُنزِلَ عَلَيْنَا وَيَكْفُرونَ بِمَا وَرَاءهُ وَهُوَ الْحَقُّ مُصَدِّقاً لِّمَا مَعَهُمْ قُلْ فَلِمَ تَقْتُلُونَ أَنبِيَاءَ اللّهِ مِن قَبْلُ إِن كُنتُم مُّؤْمِنِينَ﴾

"And when it was said to them; 'Believe in what Allah revealed', they said; 'We believe in what was revealed to us', and they disbelieve in what is after it while it is the truth confirming that which is with them. Say; why then did you kill the Prophets of Allah aforetime if you were (indeed) believers?" [TMQ 2: 91] And;

﴿وَقَالُواْ لَن يَدْخُلَ الْجَنَّةَ إِلاَّ مَن كَانَ هُوداً أَوْ نَصَارَى تِلْكَ بَلَى مَنْ أَسْلَمَ *أَمَانِيُّهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُواْ بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ وَجْهَهُ لِلّهِ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ فَلَهُ أَجْرُهُ عِندَ رَبِّهِ وَلاَ خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلاَ هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ﴾

"And they say; 'None shall enter Paradise except he be a Jew or Christian.' Those are their desires. Say; Produce your proof if you are truthful. Rather whoever submits his face to Allah and is a doer of good, his reward is with Allah. Such will not fear nor will they grieve." [TMQ 2: 112] And;

﴿وَقَالُواْ اتَّخَذَ اللّهُ وَلَداً سُبْحَانَهُ بَل لَّهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ

وَالأَرْضِ كُلٌّ لَّهُ قَانِتُونَ﴾

"And they say; 'Allah has begotten a child.' Glory be to Him! Nay, to Him belongs all that is in the heavens and the earth. All surrender to Him with obedience." [TMQ 2: 116] And;

﴿وَقَالُواْ كُونُواْ هُوداً أَوْ نَصَارَى تَهْتَدُواْ قُلْ بَلْ مِلَّةَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ نَيفاً وَمَا كَانَ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ﴾

"And they say; 'Be Jews or Christians (then) you will be guided.' Say; 'Nay, the creed of Ibrahim, and he was not of the polytheists.'" [TMQ 2: 135] And;

﴿أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِي حَآجَّ إِبْرَاهِيمَ فِي رِبِّهِ أَنْ آتَاهُ اللّهُ الْمُلْكَ إِذْ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ رَبِّيَ الَّذِي يُحْيِـــي وَيُمِيتُ قَالَ أَنَا أُحْيِـــي وَأُمِيتُ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ فَإِنَّ اللّهَ يَأْتِي بِالشَّمْسِ مِنَ الْمَشْرِقِ فَأْتِ بِهَا مِنَ الْمَغْرِبِ فَبُهِتَ الَّذِي كَفَرَ وَاللّهُ لاَ يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ﴾

"Have you not considered about he who disputed with Ibrahim about his Lord because Allah had given him the kingdom? When Ibrahim said to him; 'My Lord is He who gives life and causes death.' He said; 'I give life and cause death.' Ibrahim said; 'Verily Allah causes the sun to rise in the east thus you cause it to rise in the west.' Thus the disbeliever was utterly defeated. And Allah guides not the unjust folk." [TMQ 2: 258] Even though this *ayah* was of the *Shar'a* of those before us, it commenced with His ﷻ saying *subhanahu*; *"Have you considered (alam tara)"*, so we are addressed by it. And;

﴿الَّذِينَ قَالُواْ لإِخْوَانِهِمْ وَقَعَدُواْ لَوْ أَطَاعُونَا مَا قُتِلُوا قُلْ فَادْرَؤُوا عَنْ أَنفُسِكُمُ الْمَوْتَ إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ﴾

"Those who said about their brothers while they sat (at home); 'Had they obeyed us, they would not have been killed.' Say; avert death from yourselves if you speak the truth!" [TMQ 3: 168] And;

﴿الَّذِينَ قَالُواْ إِنَّ اللّهَ عَهِدَ إِلَيْنَا أَلاَّ نُؤْمِنَ لِرَسُولٍ حَتَّىَ يَأْتِيَنَا بِقُرْبَانٍ تَأْكُلُهُ النَّارُ قُلْ قَدْ جَاءكُمْ رُسُلٌ مِّن قَبْلِي بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَبِالَّذِي قُلْتُمْ فَلِمَ قَتَلْتُمُوهُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ﴾

"Those who said; 'Verily Allah has taken our promise not to believe in any Messenger unless he brings to us an offering which fire devours.' Say; there came to you Messengers before me with clear proofs and with what you speak of. Why then did you kill them if you are truthful?" [TMQ 3: 183] And;

"And the Jews say; 'Allah's hand is tied up!' Be their hands tied up and be they accursed for what they say! Nay, both His hands are widely outstretched. He spends as He wishes." [TMQ 5: 64] And;

﴿سَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ أَشْرَكُواْ لَوْ شَاء اللّهُ مَا أَشْرَكْنَا وَلاَ آبَاؤُنَا وَلاَ حَرَّمْنَا مِن شَيْءٍ كَذَلِكَ كَذَّبَ الَّذِينَ مِن قَبْلِهِم حَتَّى ذَاقُواْ بَأْسَنَا قُلْ هَلْ عِندَكُم مِّنْ عِلْمٍ فَتُخْرِجُوهُ لَنَا إِن تَتَّبِعُونَ إِلاَّ الظَّنَّ وَإِنْ أَنتُمْ إِلاَّ تَخْرُصُونَ﴾

"Those who associate (with Allah) will say; 'If Allah had willed, we would not have associated nor would we have forbidden anything.' Likewise belied those before them until they tasted Our wrath. Say; have you any knowledge so that you produce it for us? Verily you follow nothing but conjecture (dhann) and you do nothing but lie." [TMQ 6: 148] And;

﴿وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عُزَيْرٌ ابْنُ اللّهِ وَقَالَتْ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ اللّهِ ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُم بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ يُضَاهِؤُونَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ مِن قَبْلُ

ذَلِكَ قَوْلُهُم بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ يُضَاهِؤُونَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ مِن قَبْلُ قَاتَلَهُمُ اللّهُ أَنَّى يُؤْفَكُونَ ۞ اتَّخَذُواْ أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَاباً مِّن دُونِ اللّهِ وَالْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ وَمَا أُمِرُواْ إِلاَّ لِيَعْبُدُواْ إِلَـهاً وَاحِداً لاَّ إِلَـهَ إِلاَّ هُوَ سُبْحَانَهُ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ﴾

"And the Jews say; 'Uzayr is the son of Allah', and the Christians say; 'The Messiah is the son of Allah.' That is their saying from their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved of old. Allah's curse is upon them, how they lie! They took their rabbis and monks as lords besides Allah and the Messiah son of Mary while they were not commanded save to worship one Lord. There is no god but He. Glorified is He beyond what they associate!" [TMQ 9: 30-1] And;

﴿وَإِذَا تُتْلَى عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُنَا بَيِّنَاتٍ قَالَ الَّذِينَ لاَ يَرْجُونَ لِقَاءنَا ائْتِ بِقُرْآنٍ غَيْرِ هَـذَا أَوْ بَدِّلْهُ قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أُبَدِّلَهُ مِن تِلْقَاء نَفْسِي إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلاَّ مَا يُوحَى إِلَيَّ إِنِّي أَخَافُ إِنْ عَصَيْتُ رَبِّي عَذَابَ يَوْمٍ عَظِيمٍ قُل لَّوْ شَاء اللّهُ مَا تَلَوْتُهُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَلاَ أَدْرَاكُم بِهِ فَقَدْ لَبِثْتُ فِيكُمْ عُمُراً مِّن قَبْلِهِ أَفَلاَ تَعْقِلُونَ﴾

"And when Our clear aayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say; 'Bring us a Qur'an other than this or change it.' Say; 'it is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed unto Me. Verily I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day.' Say; 'if Allah had so willed, I should not have recited it to you nor would He have made it known to you, I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?'" [TMQ 10: 15-6] And;

﴿وَقَالُوا مَا هِيَ إِلَّا حَيَاتُنَا الدُّنْيَا نَمُوتُ وَنَحْيَا وَمَا يُهْلِكُنَا إِلَّا الدَّهْرُ وَمَا لَهُم بِذَلِكَ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّونَ ۞ وَإِذَا تُتْلَى

عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُنَا بَيِّنَاتٍ مَّا كَانَ حُجَّتَهُمْ إِلَّا أَن قَالُوا ائْتُوا بِآبَائِنَا إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ ۞ قُلِ اللَّهُ يُحْيِيكُمْ ثُمَّ يُمِيتُكُمْ ثُمَّ يَجْمَعُكُمْ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ﴾

"And they say; 'There is nothing but our life of this world, we die and we live and nothing destroys us except time.' They have no knowledge of it, they only conjecture. And when Our clear aayaat are recited to them, their argument is not other than that they say: 'Bring back our fathers if you are truthful.' Say: 'Allah gives you life then causes you to die, then He will assemble you on the Day of Resurrection about which there is no doubt but most of mankind know not." [TMQ 45: 24-6] Even the *aayaat* of *surat Al-Kahf*, which one of them used as evidence, does not depart from this style of refuting the concept or concepts of *kufr*. Neither is the dialogue - as they say - a mere intellectual process only; rather it is the understanding and refutation of the concepts of *kufr*. This is clear in the rebuke of the companion [in the story in *Al-Kahf*], and his rejection of the other's *kufr* in His ﷻ saying;

﴿كَفَرْتَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقَكَ مِن تُرَابٍ ثُمَّ مِن نُّطْفَةٍ ثُمَّ سَوَّاكَ رَجُلاً لَّكِنَّا هُوَ اللَّهُ رَبِّي وَلَا أُشْرِكُ بِرَبِّي أَحَداً وَلَوْلَا إِذْ دَخَلْتَ جَنَّتَكَ قُلْتَ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَا قُوَّةَ إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ إِن تُرَنِ أَنَا أَقَلَّ مِنكَ مَالاً وَوَلَداً فَعَسَى رَبِّي أَن يُؤْتِيَنِ خَيْراً مِّن جَنَّتِكَ وَيُرْسِلَ عَلَيْهَا حُسْبَاناً مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ فَتُصْبِحَ صَعِيداً زَلَقاً أَوْ يُصْبِحَ مَاؤُهَا غَوْراً فَلَن تَسْتَطِيعَ لَهُ طَلَباً﴾

"Do you disbelieve in He who created you from dust then out of a (nutfah) then fashioned you a man? But as for me, He is Allah my Lord and none shall I associate with my Lord. Had you, when you entered your garden, only said; whatever Allah wills (will occur), there is no power except with Allah. If you see me less than you in property and children, perhaps my Lord will give me better than your garden and send upon it a (husband) from the sky, then it will be a slippery earth. Or its water becomes deep sunken so that you will not be able to seek it." [TMQ 18: 37-41] So how can it be said that the companion did not pronounce any judgment, when in fact he rebukes the other, in His ﷻ saying;

"Do you disbelieve in He who created you?" And then he directs him to what was obliged upon him to say;

"Whatever Allah wills, there is no power except with Allah." Then he explained to him the power that the All-Capable Creator has, to send a lightning bolt and make the water disappear. So how can it be said that this is a model of religious dialogue with no restrictions or conditions, and with no judgements being pronounced, and with acceptance of the other as he is!

As for the one that has used His ﷻ saying;

﴿قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ لَا أَعْبُدُ مَا تَعْبُدُونَ وَلَا أَنتُمْ عَابِدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ﴾

"Say; o you disbelievers! I do not worship that which you worship. And you do not worship what I worship" [TMQ 109: 1-3], as an evidence for dialogue with the disbelievers, and has used His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَأَجِرْهُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ اللّهِ﴾

"If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety" [TMQ 9: 6], as an evidence for dialogue with the polytheists; this is an erroneous deduction and has been made out of the context of the *aayaat*. *Surat Al-Kafirun* has pronounced a judgment against them, which is that they are *kuffar*, and that they will remain upon their *kufr* without ever believing. Allah *subhanahu* knew that they would never ever believe and He informed His

Messenger ﷺ about that. He commanded him ﷺ to convey this to them and to reject their offer of exchanging deities yearly. So absolutely no place for dialogue after Allah *subhanahu* has informed us that they would remain disbelievers until death. This *surah* was revealed regarding specific people. Allah spoke the truth; some of them died and some of them were killed, but none of them believed. As for His *ta'ala* saying;

﴿وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَأَجِرْهُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ اللّٰهِ﴾

"If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety." [TMQ 9: 6] There is no evidence for their claims about dialogue between equals in this *ayah*. There is no indication for dialogue in it. Rather there is a command to make the polytheist hear the word of Allah; either he believes or he is escorted to his place of safety. So the *ayah* is about giving protection to the polytheist who wishes to ask about Islam, so Islam is explained to him in a way that is hoped will make him embrace it. There is no evidence in the *ayah* for dialogue that has the aim of knowing his opinions, and taking them in an equal and equivalent manner without pronouncing judgement against him. The *ayah* determines that he is a polytheist, so it pronounced a judgement of polytheism against him. It does not seek dialogue with him to know his opinions; rather it seeks to make him listen to the Qur'an. So there is no sense in using it as evidence.

5

The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation

What finishes the matter is their saying that the objective of the dialogue between civilisations is interaction in order to create an alternative, and superior, civilisation by finding out what is common between the civilisations. In turn, this will lead the civilisation to progress, and flourish and will make peace spread. How awful it is for someone to deduce this concept by using His ﷻ saying,

﴿يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلاَّ نَعْبُدَ إِلاَّ اللّٰهَ وَلاَ نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئاً وَلاَ يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضاً أَرْبَاباً﴾

"Say; o People of the Book. Come to a just word between us; that we worship none but Allah nor associate anything with Him nor some of us taking each other as lords." [TMQ 3: 64] We find him [the one deducing this idea] saying; "This is a dialogue with others from a position of equality." Then he interprets His ﷻ saying, *"to a just word",* to mean a word that is, "common (*mushtarak*) between us", and that, "we do not say we [have] dialogue to [bring them to] our word (our views)." This understanding of the *ayah* is a slander upon Allah, as the meaning of, *"sawaa"*, is 'just', ie a just word, which is what the *ayah* explains subsequently. There is nothing in the *ayah*, whether in its wording or its meaning, which indicates that we invite them to a common word. He definitely did not intend that we agree on a just word by the evidence of his saying; "we do not say that we [have] dialogue to [bring them to] our word (our views)", so there is no other meaning left to take [from his words] except that he wants a common civilisation. The call for interaction and for trying to find commonality between the civilisations is simply mixing the truth with falsehood; Allah prohibited the People of the Book from doing this, and also the Muslims by greater reason. He *ta'ala* said;

﴿يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لِمَ تَلْبِسُونَ الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُونَ الْحَقَّ وَأَنتُمْ

﴿تَعْلَمُونَ﴾

"O People of the Book, why do you mix the truth with falsehood while you know?" [TMQ 3: 71]

Now that their intentions and objectives for the inter-religion and inter-civilisation dialogue are clear, we can move onto the issue of the clash and its various forms; economic, intellectual, military and political.

6

The Clash Between Civilisations

THE HISTORY OF THE CLASH BETWEEN ISLAM AND OTHER CIVILISATIONS

The clash, or struggle, between religions and civilisations is ancient. What concerns us here is the clash between Islam and the other religions and civilisations. The truth is that Islam is a *deen* of struggle; from the time when Muhammad ﷺ was commanded to come out openly with the truth until The [Final] Hour is established. When he ﷺ was ordered to openly speak what he was commanded, the intellectual struggle between the concepts of Islam and the concepts of *kufr* commenced. This intellectual struggle has continued up to our time. It has not stopped; nor is it allowed to stop, despite all the other types of struggle that have been added to it. Intellectual struggle is the refutation of thoughts with sharp styles, intensity, and harshness. The Messenger ﷺ performed intellectual struggle in executing the command of Allah. So he would say;

﴿إِنَّكُمْ وَمَا تَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ حَصَبُ جَهَنَّمَ أَنتُمْ لَهَا وَارِدُونَ﴾

"Verily you and what you worship besides Allah are fuel for the Hellfire! Surely you will enter it." [TMQ 21: 98] And;

﴿هَمَّازٍ مَّشَّاء بِنَمِيمٍ مَّنَّاعٍ لِّلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٍ أَثِيمٍ عُتُلٍّ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ زَنِيمٍ﴾

"A slanderer, going about with calumnies. A hinderer of good, transgressor, sinful. Cruel, after all that, base-born." [TMQ 68: 11-13] And;

﴿ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ أَيُّهَا الضَّالُّونَ الْمُكَذِّبُونَ لَآكِلُونَ مِن شَجَرٍ مِّن زَقُّومٍ فَمَالِؤُونَ مِنْهَا الْبُطُونَ فَشَارِبُونَ عَلَيْهِ مِنَ الْحَمِيمِ فَشَارِبُونَ شُرْبَ الْهِيمِ هَذَا نُزُلُهُمْ يَوْمَ الدِّينِ نَحْنُ خَلَقْنَاكُمْ فَلَوْلَا تُصَدِّقُونَ﴾

"Then, verily, you misguided, deniers. You will surely eat of the tree of Zaqqum. Then you will fill bellies therewith. Drink boiling water on top of it. So you will drink the drinking of thirsty camels. That will be their entertainment on the Day of Recompense! We created you, so why do you not believe?" [TMQ 56: 51-7] And;

﴿إِنَّ الْمُجْرِمِينَ فِي ضَلَالٍ وَسُعُرٍ﴾

"Verily the criminals are in misguidance and will burn!" [TMQ 54: 47] And;

﴿ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ فَنَجْعَل لَّعْنَةَ اللّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِينَ﴾

"The curse of Allah upon the deniers." [TMQ 3: 61] And;

﴿تَبَّتْ يَدَا أَبِي لَهَبٍ وَتَبَّ﴾

"Perish the hands of Abu Lahab and he has perished." [TMQ 111: 1] And;

﴿إِنَّ شَانِئَكَ هُوَ الْأَبْتَرُ﴾

"Verily the one who makes you angry will be cut off." [TMQ 108: 3] This intellectual struggle does not contradict with His ﷻ saying;

﴿ادْعُ إِلِى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُم بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَن ضَلَّ عَن سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ﴾

"Invite to the way of your Lord with (hikma) and fair preaching. And argue with them with what is better. Verily your Lord knows best who has gone astray from His way and He knows best those who are guided." [TMQ 16: 125] This is because the *hikma* here is the intellectual proof and the irrefutable evidence, whilst the fair preaching is the beautiful reminder. The beautiful reminder is by impressing the thoughts and emotions collectively like His ﷻ saying;

﴿إِنَّ جَهَنَّمَ كَانَتْ مِرْصَاداً لِلْطَّاغِينَ مَآباً لَابِثِينَ فِيهَا أَحْقَاباً لَّا يَذُوقُونَ فِيهَا بَرْداً وَلَا شَرَاباً إِلَّا حَمِيماً وَغَسَّاقاً جَزَاء وِفَاقاً﴾

"Verily Hell is a place of ambush. A dwelling place for the transgressors. Abiding therein for ages. No cool shall they taste therein nor any drink. Except boiling water and pus. An exact recompense!" [TMQ 78: 21-6] To argue with what is better means to avoid the harm of the one who you are arguing with. So you turn away from his insults (meaning you ignore him). Likewise there is no contradiction between intellectual struggle and His ﷻ saying *ta'ala*;

﴿وَلَا تُجَادِلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْهُمْ﴾

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with that which is better except those who do wrong among them." [TMQ 29: 46] The action that is better is to turn away from the harm (insults) they direct at you in the argument. The argument with those who do wrong - by fighting, refusing to live under the rule [of Islam] and pay the Jizyah - is through the use of the sword. An example of his ﷻ intellectual struggle is what was reported from Qatadah by ibn Abi Sheeba and Abdurrazaq in their *Musannaf*, the writers of *Seerah* and also a variety of others;

رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لرجل نصراني ((أسلم أبا الحارث, فقال النصراني قد أسلمت, فقال له أسلم أبا الحارث, فقال قد أسلمت, فقال له الثالة أسلم أبا الحارث, فقال قد أسلكت قبلك, فغضب و قال كذبت حال بينك وبين الإسلام

خلال ثلاث شريك الخمر و لم يقل شربك, و أكلك الخنزير و دعاؤك لله ولداً.))

"The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to a man; 'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said; 'I have embraced Islam.' So he said; 'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said; 'I have embraced Islam.' So he said to him the third time; 'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said; 'I have embraced Islam before you.' So he became angry and said; 'You lie. Three matters stood between you and Islam; your purchasing of wine,[1] your eating of pig and your calling a child Allah's." As-Sana'ni reported in his *Tafseer* from Abdurrazaq from Qatadah that Ubayy ibn Khalaf came with a decaying tooth [in his hand] and was crumbling it in the wind. He said to Muhammad ﷺ; "Will Allah give life to this, O Muhammad?" The Prophet ﷺ said;

((نعم يحيى الله هذا ويميتك ويدخلك النار))

"Yes, Allah will give life to it and cause you to die and enter you into the Fire!" Al-Hakim authenticated and reported in *Al-Mustadrak* from Jabir ibn Abdullah ﷺ who said;

((إجتمعت قريش يوماً فأتاه عتبة بن ربيعة بن عبد شمس فقال : يا محمد أنت خير أم عبد الله؟ ... فسكت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أفرغت, قال نعم, فقرأ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم :{ بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمنِ الرَّحِيمِ* حم* تَنزِيلٌ مِّنَ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ} حتى بلغ { فَإِنْ أَعْرَضُوا فَقُلْ أَنذَرْتُكُمْ صَاعِقَةً مِّثْلَ صَاعِقَةِ عَادٍ وَثَمُودَ} فقال له عتبة:

حسبك حسبك ما عندك غير هذا؟ قال: لا, فرجع عتبة إلى قريش فقالوا ما وراءك؟ فقال: ما تركت شيئاً أرى أنكم تكلمونه إلا قد كلنته, قالوا: فهل أجابك؟ قال: نعم و الذي نصبها بنية ما فهمت شيئاً مما قال غير أنه أنذركم صاعقة مثل صاعقة عاد و ثمود. قالوا: ويلك يكلمك رجل بالعربية و لا تدري ما قال؟ قال: لا و الله ما فهمت شيئاً مما قال غير ذكر الصاعقة.))

"Quraysh convened one day and Utbah ibn Rabi'ah came to him and said; 'O Muhammad, are you better or Abdullah?' The Messenger of Allah ﷺ was silent. Then the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said; 'Have you finished?' He said; 'Yes.' So the Messenger of Allah ﷺ recited; '*Bismillah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem. Ha Meem. A revelation from Allah, ir-Rahmaan, ir-Raheem*', until he reached; '*But if they turn away, then say; I have warned you of a lightning bold like the lightning bolt of 'Ad and Thamud*',[2] Utbah said to him; 'It is enough, it is enough. Have you anything other than this?' He said; 'No.' So he returned to Quraysh and they said; 'What is behind you?' He said; 'I did not leave anything that I thought you would say to him except that I said it to him.' They said; 'Did he answer you?' He said; 'Yes. By the One who set upright the structure, I understood nothing of what he said except that he warned you of a lightning bolt of 'Aad and Thamud.' They said; 'Woe unto you, a man spoke to you in Arabic and you do not know what he said?' He said; 'No, by Allah, I understood nothing except the mentioning of the lighting bolt.'" This is some of what was narrated about his ﷺ intellectual struggle.

Likewise, some of the Sahabah would do these types of actions. Ibn Ishaq narrated from Az-Zubair who said; "The first to loudly recite the Qur'an in Makkah after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was 'Abdullah ibn Mas'oud ﷺ. He [Az-Zubair] said; The companions of the Messenger of

Allah ﷺ assembled one day and said; 'By Allah, the Quraysh have not heard the Qur'an being loudly recited yet, so which man will make them hear it?' 'Abdullah ibn Mas'oud said; 'Me.' They said; 'Verily we fear them against you. We intend a person who has kinsfolk who will protect him from the people if they have evil designs upon him.' He [Ibn Mas'oud] said; 'Leave me. Allah will protect me.' He [Az-Zubair] said; On the next day, Ibn Mas'oud came to the *maqam* [of Ibrahim at the Ka'aba] in the forenoon and recited; '*Bismillah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem*', raising his voice, '*Ar-Rahmaan. Allam al Qur'an*'. Then he faced them reciting it. He [Az-zubair] said; They contemplated it then began asking; 'What is ibn Umm 'Abd saying?' He [Az-Zubair] said; then they said; 'He is reciting some of what Muhammad came with.' So they stood and began striking upon his face and he maintained reciting upto the place that Allah willed that he reaches. Then he left to go to his companions, and he had been injured in the face. They said to him; 'This is what we feared for you.' He said; 'The enemies of Allah were no more contemptible to me than now, and if you wish I will awake for the like tomorrow.' They said; 'No, it is enough for you, what you said. You have made them hear what they detest.'" Ibn Kathir reported in *Jami' Al-Masaneed wa As-Sunan*; "From Hatib whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had sent to Juraij ibn Mina who was the Muqawqis of Alexandria who said to him; 'Why does your Prophet not invoke against those who expelled him from his land?' He said to him; 'Just as your Prophet did not invoke against those who intended to kill him until Allah raised him to Him.' He said to him; 'You have acted well. You are a wise man coming from a wise man.'" Al-Hakim reported in *Al-Mustadrak* - and termed it *saheeh* upon the conditions of the two *Shayukh* [Al-Bukhari and Muslim] - that Abu Musa ؓ said; "The Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded us to depart to the land of An-Najashi. That reached Quraysh and they sent Amr ibn Al-As and 'Amara ibn Al-Waleed, and they collected gifts for An-Najashi. They came to us and advanced to An-Najashi, arrived to him with gifts, kissed him and prostrated to him. Then Amr ibn Al-As said; 'Verily a folk from us disliked our religion and they are in your land.' An-Najashi said to him; 'In my land?' He said; 'Yes.' He [An-Najashi] said; 'Send them to me.' Ja'far said to us; 'Let none of you speak. I am your speaker today.' So we reached An-Najashi while he was sitting in his assembly, Amr at his right and 'Amara at his left, and the priests and monks seated. Amr and Amara said to him [An-Najashi]; 'They do not prostrate to you.' When we reached him, the priests and monks with him chided us; 'Prostrate to your king.' Ja'far said; 'We do not prostrate except to Allah.' An-Najashi said to him; 'And who is that?' He said; 'Verily Allah sent among us His Messenger, and he is the Messenger that Isa prophesied (to come) after him whose name is Ahmad. He commanded us to worship Allah without associating anything with Him, to establish the prayer, pay the zakat, and he commanded us the good and forbade us from the evil.' He [Abu Musa] said; His words amazed the people. When Amr saw that, he said to him; 'Allah prosper the king. They oppose you in Isa ibn Maryam.' So An-Najashi said to Ja'far; 'What does your companion say about the son of Mary?' He said; 'He says about him the saying of Allah; he is the spirit of Allah and His word that He brought forth from the maiden virgin whom no man had approached.' He [Abu Musa] said; 'Then An-Najashi picked a stick from the ground, then raised it and said; 'O priests and monks, these do no exceed the width of this [regarding] what you say about Isa ibn Maryam. Welcome to you and to the one whom you came from. Verily I bear witness that he is the Messenger of Allah, and that he is the one Isa ibn Maryam prophesied of. Were it not for what I am on of kingship, I would go to him until I carry his shoes. Dwell in my land as long as you wish', and he commanded food and clothing for them. And he said; 'Return to these two their gifts.'" Ahmad reported this hadith in greater length from Umm Salamah ؓ, and it is more detailed than the hadith of Abu Musa ؓ. Al-Haithami reported it in *Al-Majma'a* and said that its men are the men of the *saheeh* (ahadith) apart from ibn Ishaq, and he explicitly stated that he heard it. Muslims remained in an intellectual and military struggle with the religions and civilisations of *kufr* after his death ﷺ - in the same way as what will come - until Islam spreads across all the regions of the ancient world leaving only a small part untouched. People entered into Islam in crowds, and left their previous religions and civilisations and became a new single Ummah, with its *'aqeedah*, thoughts, view on life, system, and interests being singular, and its highest ideal only one; to raise the word of Allah to be the highest. It assumed the position of the leading state in the world, and its towns became the radiant centres of the enlightened thought; the *'aqeedah* of *tawheed* and the just *Shari'ah*. They carried the Book, the *Sunnah*, and the Arabic language to the world so that Islam became the ideology of everyone, great interest developed in the Arabic language, until there emerged *mujtahidoon* and scholars of language amongst the people, without any difference between Arab and non-Arabs, until they became brothers by the favour of Allah. Today, we see a vicious campaign

against the Arabic language to detach it from Islam through the use of wicked styles such as the call to colloquialism, the writing of the Muslims' other languages in the Latin alphabet, and considering local colloquial languages as Arabic. It is known that it is impossible for the one who does not know Arabic to understand Islam, not to mention performing *ijtihad* with it. They want Arabic to become like Latin and Aramaic such that nobody understands Islam except the experts in this unused language. In reality, they want it to become a dead language. How would the one who does not understand Arabic be able to understand the news (*khabar*), composition (*insha'a*), command (*'amr*), prohibition (*nahy*), the literal (*haqeeqa*) and metaphoric (*majaz*), the reason (*'illah*), cause (*sabab*), condition (*shart*), preventive (*maan'i*), general (*a'amm*), specific (*khaas*), absolute (*mutlaq*), restricted (*muqayyad*), the indications of the explicit wording (*mantooq*), the understood (*mafhoom*), necessity (*iltizam*) and the meanings of the letters, conjugation, grammar and so on? All of these are necessary to understand the *Shari'ah* texts. Whoever calls to any of these deviations is an enemy of Islam, and whoever is fooled by these falsehoods from amongst the Muslims is stupid.

However, it was not common to embrace the *deen* in a complete and perfect way - even among the Arabs themselves. The defeated religions and civilisations remained present. At the beginning the protagonists [of the defeated ideas] were weak, owing to the disappearance of the environments that allowed their growth. Thus the movements of the heretics failed and were suppressed. However, neglecting the Arabic language afterwards led to the gates of ijtihad being closed and confusion in understanding the rules ensued. This weakened the State until it became fragmented into petty states. Some thoughts of the ancient civilisations forced their way into the Muslims; ideas of asceticism and punishing the body from Hindu philosophy, ideas of tribalism, the idea of hidden secret meanings [within the *deen*], and the inclination to separate from the centre of the Khilafah all weakened the State and stopped its conquests. Rather the Crusaders and Tatars coveted the State until the Ottomans came and unified most of its regions under their authority and resumed the conquests. However, the military character dominated and it didn't carry the ideology in the correct manner, so the peoples of the conquered lands were not melted together by the crucible of Islam as had occurred in the first conquests. It is possible to perceive the difference between the Uzbek, Tajik, Pushtun, Turkish, Berber,

Indian, Turkmen and Kurdish peoples, their love for Islam and adherence to it, and the peoples conquered in the period of the Ottomans like the Serbs, Greeks, Hungarians, Croats, Romanians and others. These quickly conspired with the West against Islam and their state, and they never abstained whenever they were offered an opportunity for vengeance. Then the cultural and missionary invasions against Islam started until the western civilisation achieved the destruction of the Islamic State, fragmented it, and divided the *jama'ah* of the Muslims. Nor did western capitalism stop at that limit; rather it worked to spread its concepts of nationalism, patriotism, Democracy, freedom, man-made canons, and imaginary borders amongst the Muslims. It appointed over these petty states corrupt rulers who were allied to them and who consolidated their influence and concepts, protected its interests, preserved the divisions, and deviated from the way of Allah and opposed every sincere person who attempted to free himself from their noose. The intellectual agents who invite to, and defend, the western thoughts with passion, and struggle against the Islamic civilisation, standing with blind sincerity to the side of the Ummah's enemy, assisted them in their actions. The Crusader enemies and their agents among the influential people in the Muslim countries put the media means and education under their control; so they became misguided and misguiding. This intellectual assault did not stop, so the call to the concepts of western civilisation such as freedom, Democracy, pluralism, civil society, the state of institutions, human rights, women's rights, patriotism, religious dialogue, and many ideas besides these, is still proceeding with full force. So it is truly a violent intellectual struggle between the two civilisations; Islamic and capitalist. This clash is so clear that it requires no evidence, because we are living it daily; no matter how much some intellectuals and the influential capitalists attempt to hide it through distortion and deception. For example, the former American president Nixon said in his book, 'Seize the Moment'; "An America withdrawn into isolationism would not be true to itself. Our values, derived from our religious tradition, demand public as well as private virtue." He also says in his book 'Victory without War'; "Islamic revolutionary ideology is a reaction against modernization. Communism promises to turn the clock of history forward. Muslim fundamentalists turn it back." Berlusconi, the current Italian prime minister, said; "We should be confident of the superiority of our civilization. [The West] is bound to Occidentalize and conquer new people. It has done it with the Communist world and part of the Islamic world." Teri Larson, the

coordinator of the Oslo process, welcomed the inclination of Muslims of Palestine towards normalization with the West. One member of the Jewish delegation in Oslo and Wye River, Uri Savir, mentioned in his book 'The Process'; "The scarves started to disappear from the heads of women, and the dresses started to be shortened from the lower part, a matter that Larson welcomed, considering it inclined towards normalization with the West." In fact women would not dare to do that during the first Intifada before Oslo. Also Phyllis Oakley, former Under-Secretary of State said; "We agree with those who say that the clash of civilisations cannot be avoided." Madeleine Albright, former US foreign secretary, said; "We were attacked because of our identity. We adhere to globalisation and defend democracy, freedom and open society. This is the essence of America from which we cannot retreat." [*Al-Quds* magazine quoting from the translated words of Nathan Charles-Washington] Paul Kennedy, History professor at Yale University in America said; "It is hard to avoid the conclusion that not only is the threat of terrorist attacks not going to go away, but also that we are not going to be very successful in preventing them. The genie is out of the bottle with a vengeance; the car-bomb has now become the plane-bomb." [*Al-Quds* magazine in translated words of 22/9/2001] The former Jewish president, Hertzog, said before the Polish parliament in 1992; "The disease [of Islamic fundamentalism] is spreading rapidly and constitutes not only a danger to the Jewish people, but to humanity in general." [*Al-'Arabi* magazine number 514] Shimon Peres said; "After the fall of Communism, fundamentalism has become the greatest danger of our time." [*Al-'Arabi* magazine number 514] Cyrus Vance, former American foreign secretary, said; "We must be careful and resolved in dealing with these fanatics whose actions are impossible to predict." [*Al-'Arabi* magazine number 514] The French cultural encyclopaedia states that Muhammad ﷺ is; "Anti-Christ, kidnapper of women, and the greatest enemy to the human intellect."

These and their like explicitly state their enmity to Islam, and their statements are a clear indication that they and their capitalist civilisation engage in a violent intellectual struggle against the Islamic civilisation. However, there is another group that attempts to blow smoke into the eyes of the Muslims and delude them, in order to perpetuate the anaesthesia that the Muslims are subjected to, and to make them desist from generating change. However, these people are not any less hostile

to Islam and its people. So the former American president Clinton said; "Our enemy in the Middle East is extremism, and he rejected the idea of the clash of civilisations. Similarly he said that the current struggle has no relationship with Islam; however, it is a struggle against extremist forces that hide with religion and nationalism. He added saying that contradicts with Islamic teachings and emphasised that Islam is a powerful force for tolerance and moderation in the world." [*Al-'Arabi* magazine number 514] Louis Mitchell (Belgian foreign secretary) said, whilst commenting upon the above-mentioned statements of Berlusconi; "When a Prime Minister of a member state of the European Union speaks with this logic, this is completely rejected. The view that any civilisation is better or of a more advanced position than other civilisations is considered as contradicting European values in which we all believe." [Above mentioned study circle of *Al-Jazeera*] Even Bush Jr. who openly declared the, "Crusade", went to visit the Islamic Centre in Washington and describing Islam as a *deen* of peace. Similarly his partner in this campaign, the British Prime Minister Blair, described Islam as being a *deen* of peace, and he used the meaning of the noble *ayah* as evidence;

﴿مَن قَتَلَ نَفْساً بِغَيْرِ نَفْسٍ أَوْ فَسَادٍ فِي الأَرْضِ فَكَأَنَّمَا قَتَلَ النَّاسَ جَمِيعاً﴾

"Whoever kills a soul for other than a soul or (to spread) mischief in the earth, it is as if he killed all of mankind." [TMQ 5: 32] It is imperative that Muslims are not beguiled by the deceptive words of these people and those like them, since it is their actions that reveal their deep-rooted feelings and not their false words, which do not fool Muslims.

These people know Islam in its reality; rather better than even some Muslims. Nixon, the former American president, whose sayings we have already mentioned, said; "Their intolerant ideas…Muslim fundamentalists turn it back… Islamic revolutionaries are ideological enemies". We also find him saying in his book, 'Seize the Moment'; "Islam is not merely a religion; rather it is a basis for a great civilisation." So he distinguishes Islam from Christianity, and he says in the same book in his discussion about fundamentalists; "They are motivated by a consuming hatred of the West and a determination to restore the superiority of Islamic civilization by resuscitating the past. They seek to impose the Shar'ia,

the code of law based on the Koran that recognizes no separation of Church and State." Furthermore he says; "However, our civilisation is not more advanced than their civilisation. The Islamic world fought communism with more strength than the western world fought it, and their rejection of material things and the widespread immoral excesses in the western world is a credit for them and not against them." We see that he is sincere in such words; however, they did not prevent him from pronouncing us ideological enemies. His words also didn't prevent him from conspiring against the Muslims and assisting the Jews against them. So he says in his book 'Victory without War'; "Or commitment to the survival of Israel runs deep. We are not formal allies, but we are bound together by something much stronger than any piece of paper: a moral commitment. It is a commitment which no president in the past has ever broken and which every future President will faithfully honor. America will never allow the sworn enemies of Israel to achieve their goal of destroying it." He also says in his book, 'Seize the Moment'; "To secure our top priority among these values, the survival of threatened democratic states such as Israel and South Korea, we should be prepared to employ military force if necessary." He also says; "No American President or Congress will ever allow the destruction of Israel." These people understand the reality of Islam and its civilisation; however, they insist upon their *kufr*, enmity and tricks. This is not strange. The Muslim might understand the western civilisation more than some of its sons, and yet he still remains sincere to his *deen* and civilisation; similarly the opposite can occur. So it is imperative that Muslims are not fooled by these types of statements.

The existence of the rightly guided Khilafah upon the way of Prophethood is the fundamental cornerstone in the clash between Islam and *kufr*. It is naivety and poor understanding to confine the struggle with its various forms to only mere da'wah in the various types of media, books and with individual contacts, at a time when Islam is not implemented and the situation of Muslims is deplorable in its weakness, disgrace, backwardness and division. Once The State existed then justice, dignity, happiness, humanity and every type of goodness will be manifested in it; and those that are close and those that are far away, both Muslim and *kafir* will notice that. Its existence will replace millions of books and contacts, and thousands of types of media. If what was mentioned before is added to its existence, you will see people entering

the *deen* of Allah in crowds.

[1] He did not say; "your drinking of wine"
[2] TMQ 41:1-13

7
Forms of the Clash of Civilisation

INTELLECTUAL STRUGGLE

The intellectual struggle between Islam and the remaining *kufr* civilisations is a factual reality; it is obligatory upon Muslims, even when the *kuffar* did not initiate the struggle against them. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ initiated it in Makkah before the State and after the stage of culture. The situation has remained like this until our time and it will remain until Allah wills. It is really quite apparent, even if it is obscure and concealed from the view of some people. Whoever studied the books of Creeds and Sects (*Al-Millal wan-Nihal*) will find intellectual struggle in them with all the thoughts that Muslims knew.

This struggle between the western civilisation and Islamic civilisation is manifested in many styles including:

1. Dominance over the media apparatus and directing them for the benefit of the capitalist civilisation.

2. Dominance over the education syllabi at all its levels in order to spread the western concepts, distort and fight some of the concepts of Islamic civilisation and forge the history of Muslims.

3. Establishing schools and universities directly supervised by westerners.

4. Setting up parties that adopt western civilisation and call for it, and which are protected by the West and its moderate progressive friends.

5. Sponsoring those whom they call the elite, educated and intellectuals, focusing light upon them and promoting them, so that they become the leaders of thought in the countries of the Islamic world.

6. Funding the educational scholarships and courses in their various types, to choose those suitable to become their intellectual or political agents ie spies.

7. Founding institutions, clubs and centres specialised in spreading their poison, and spending generously in supporting them.

8. Fighting the Arabic language and reviving non-Arabic languages, and inciting nationalistic and patriotic feelings.

Even what is termed as the struggle for interests is originally founded upon intellectual differences and is followed by intellectual struggle. This struggle over interests can potentially become military conflict. The one who is weak and not able to engage in military conflict does not set out to engage in the struggle for interests; or they do it only to the same extent as the hyena or fox when they struggle with the lion for its prey. This struggle for interests can be between two different civilisations, just as it is possible to be between two countries or peoples of one civilisation. When America invaded the Gulf, occupied it, extended its influence upon it, settled, established itself and gained ground, its goal was definitely not the liberation of Kuwait; rather it was a struggle over the oil interests and was for spreading their influence. As one of them said; "We came to correct the mistake of the Lord" ie His *subhanahu wa ta'ala* creating oil in the Gulf instead of the West. Schultz said in a television programme on 16/12/90; "It is necessary to demolish Iraq militarily, even if it withdrew from Kuwait." And Dick Cheney said before Congress on 3/12/90; "It is necessary to guarantee that this type of invasion is not repeated irrespective of the manner of settling this, and even if Saddam withdrew from Kuwait." It is known that until that time Iraq, Kuwait and the rest of the Gulf were a region of British influence, so America was struggling with Britain politically and economically, even though both of them belong to one civilisation, namely capitalism. At the same time, it was struggling with the Muslims politically, economically and militarily, and it adopts capitalism and struggles with the Muslims who have abandoned their Islamic civilisation or most of its concepts. The styles of America's struggle with the Muslims are built upon what is a civilisational concept for them, namely colonizing weaker nations and subjugating them; look at how it is now repeating the attack in Central Asia. Likewise its struggle with Britain is built upon another civilisational

concept, which is different to that upon which its struggle with Arabs is built. It struggles with Britain in the Gulf because it absolutely has to be alone in its leadership of the New World, and in plundering the resources of the weak. America, as Bush says, must be the vanguard so there is clearly no scope for two poles in the world leadership; rather there is only one leader, which must be America, the heir of ancient colonialism, without rival. Among the examples of struggles between two civilisations is the struggle that existed between America - the capitalists - and the communist Soviet Union. However, it did not reach the point of military conflict, and was restricted to the political, intellectual and economic struggles that ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union. From the examples of struggle between the products of a single civilisation is the struggle between the Nazis and others among the capitalists; it was a struggle between those who viewed the German race as superior to other races and those who denied there was a racial distinction between the races of the European and American peoples that adopt capitalism. However, the struggle remained within the domain of one civilisation. It was based upon a specific concept that was a part of the Nazis' civilisation and was opposite to the concepts of the Allies.

The intellectual struggle is the basis for every struggle on the face of the earth from the difference between the two sons of Adam until now; and it will continue until Allah wills. Accordingly, we have mentioned the intellectual struggle first.

ECONOMIC STRUGGLE

Economic struggle has existed from ancient times. However, today it has become organized, comprehensive, destructive and dreadful, such that the followers of the powerful civilisation started to devour the slaves of Allah, among the followers of other civilisations, without mercy, sympathy or humanity. The world has thus become nothing but a large jungle where the strong devour the weak. It is true that the world is a small village in relation to communication and transport; however, it is a jungle in respect of the supremacy of the strong over the weak. This is evident in the styles that capitalism uses - particularly its leader America - including:

First: Domination over raw materials whenever a way to achieve that is found.

Second: Making the dollar an alternative to gold as the world's currency. Europe tries to struggle against its hegemony with its currency called the 'Euro', and some states try to return to the gold and silver standard. However, America fights any attempt to return to the gold standard.

Third: Continuing to make the developing countries mere markets for consumption by preventing them from developing heavy industry, and even many light industries.

Fourth: Drowning the developing countries with compound interest loans through the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. The danger of these loans is obvious.

Fifth: Attracting the emigrant professionals and intellectuals who do not find any place for themselves in their original countries, and so are forced to emigrate to the West.

Sixth: Formulating policies, predominantly imposed by the IMF, leading to the absence of food security in these countries, such that they fall under the mercy of aid, grants and loans, even after they have been self-sufficient.

Seventh: Igniting regional wars in order to push states to purchase weapons, which quickly transform into outdated, insignificant, and rusting scrap metal; that is unless they are used in their regional wars.

Eighth: Working for the absence of security in various countries, such that their capital migrates to more secure countries like Europe and America, which they then freeze under various pretexts whenever they wish. If we know that the Arab countries alone have capital in the West amounting to 800 billion dollars at the lowest estimate, we are able to imagine, even if only approximately, what has been plundered from the Islamic lands; all of them under-developed countries. And this is without mentioning other developing countries.

Ninth: Dominating economic interests in various countries through

what they call globalisation, privatisation and capital investments owned by giant capitalist corporations.

Tenth: Designating rulers who are their agents together with armies and intelligence services whose function is to protect their interests.

Eleventh: Setting down armed forces in some sensitive global regions and settling there, to perpetuate the extension of influence; as America did in the Gulf, Sinai, Central Asia, Turkey and elsewhere. This is in addition to the naval fleets that cruise the oceans to secure the plundering of the wealth.

Twelfth: Working to fragment the world into many countries in the name of independence, in order to perpetuate the weakness of these nations and facilitate dominance over them.

Thirteenth: Spreading their culture and civilisational concepts to perpetuate dominance over the defeated countries and to keep them away from thinking about change and liberation from their claws.

Fourteenth: Imposing sanctions upon some countries, like the sanctions America imposed upon Iraq. It issued resolutions through the Security Council (Number 665) to boycott Iraq and grant the American Navy the right to use force to prevent trade with Iraq. Bob Woodward commented on this resolution in his book 'The Commanders' saying; "This was the first time in United Nations history extending forty five years that it granted countries outside its umbrella the right to impose economic sanctions. This was a magnificent diplomatic victory for the American administration."

POLITICAL STRUGGLE

As for the political struggle between the western civilisation and Muslims; it is quite clear from the following:

First: Their destruction of the Khilafah in 1924.

Second: Their establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, and their preservation of it and its characteristic military supremacy.

Third: Their division of the Muslims' *jama'ah* and the encouragement of this division under the guise of independence until the community became about sixty entities; and they still work for fragmentation and division. The danger of destructive fragmentation is not hidden from the intelligent. Muslims are strongly inclined to this idea of independence and fighting for its sake even though it completely clashes with their civilisation and concepts. Allah commanded them to be one body and not to be divided, but they proceed on the path of division and sanctify the division, even though they recite His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَاعْتَصِمُواْ بِحَبْلِ اللّهِ جَمِيعاً وَلاَ تَفَرَّقُواْ﴾

"Hold fast, all together, to the rope of Allah and do not divide" [TMQ 3: 103], day and night. All together (*jami'an*) is the condition of those holding fast to the rope of Allah. Its meaning is the *jama'ah*; in fact it is the community itself due to his ﷺ saying;

((من أتاكم و أمركم جميع على رجل واحد يريد أن يشق عصاكم أو يفرق جماعتكم فأقتلوه.))

"Whoever comes to you and your affair is united under one man aiming to break your power or divide your community (*jama'ah*), kill him!" So all together (*jami'an*) and *jama'ah* under one man, have the same meaning.

Fourth: Officially implementing their political systems, republican and monarchical in the Islamic regions, together with the official separation of the authority into three separate authorities just as they have.

Fifth: They are fighting the serious movements that are working for change by establishing the Islamic State; the rightly guided Khilafah State. At times they call them extremists and at other times they call them fundamentalists. This fight is mostly through the use of their agents and it is rare for it to be direct. Martin Indyck, the official responsible for Middle Eastern affairs stood in the White House to say that the challenge facing America in the East is assisting friendly countries to contain extremism [*Al-'Arabi* magazine number 514]. If they are unable to contain it, they suppress it with harshness and malice through their

"progressive moderate friends", those about whom Nixon said in, 'Seize the Moment'; "The policies of each country in the Muslim world have less to do with Islam than how Islam has interacted with its national culture and traditions… Modernism. Most prominent but least visible…seeks to integrate the countries of the Muslim world, both economically and politically. Tolerance marks the key thrust of modernist Islam, with the nations of the West not condemned as 'unbelievers' but embraced as other peoples 'of the book.' Some modernist states, such as Turkey and Pakistan, are democracies… We should support the modernists in the Muslim world… The key to U.S. policy of discriminating engagement is to undertake *strategic* cooperation only with modernist regimes…Because we share common goals with the modernists, our cooperation should cover the full range of economic and security issues...our special relationship must not be patronizing. We should address modernist leaders not as errand boys, but as full and equal partners. The quickest way to nail their coffins shut would be to create the impression that they are merely convenient mouthpieces for the West… We must also accept the fact that at times it does not serve our interests for our friends in the Muslim world to support our positions on issues that are highly sensitive politically in their countries." The Ummah knows these "progressive moderate friends" well, and there is nothing wrong in reminding her of what the rulers of Iraq, Egypt, Turkey, Uzbekistan, Algeria, Syria, Libya and Tunisia do to the sincere among the sons of this Ummah.

Sixth: Founding the United Nations and Security Council to grant legitimacy to intervene in the affairs of weak countries, among them the states in the Islamic world. If America could not intervene through the Security Council because of the wrangling of some world powers, it bypasses the Security Council and United Nations and acts independently in a solitary manner. This is the case now, with what it called the "War on Terrorism". So the US goes out wherever it likes and strikes whomever it likes. Nixon stated explicitly in his book 'Seize the Moment' about this policy saying; "When the interests of the United States are exposed to harm, it will act in coordination with the UN whenever possible. However, if the matter was not possible, it will act alone without assistance from it." Collard Power, political science professor at Massachusetts University, said in one of his articles; "It is clear that international law does not apply to the western hemisphere…It seems

that breach of human rights is accepted as long as it serves American interests."

Seventh: Assembling a number of profiteers and tyrants who are termed parties. The power is handed over to one of them and the remainder are classed as opposition. This is, of course, only the case if they didn't impose, what they term, the "single party system".

These are some of the forms of the political struggle that the followers of the capitalist civilisation wage upon Muslims and others. They succeeded in all these forms because of the absence of the excellent guardian and system that is realised in the Khilafah State.

MILITARY CONFLICT

We now move onto the last type of conflict between civilisations; that is the military conflict. The Muslims know it as jihad; it is a vast subject. What concerns us here is proving that the military conflict is inevitable, particularly in the Islamic civilisation. Also to refute those who deny the obligation of offensive fighting (*qital ut-talab*), and to rebut those who say that Islam is the *deen* of tolerance and peace; so then is Islam a *deen* of terror?

We begin with the actions of the *kafir* civilisations' followers with the Muslims; their actions are more eloquent in indicating [the truth] than words, because their actions are tangible and sensed. Australia whom we have never fought, even once, occupied East Timor. China occupies an entire region of southern central Asia; Russia occupies several Islamic regions like the Caucasus region, Crimea and Khazan amongst others. India occupies Delhi, Kashmir and the whole of northern India. The Americans dominate the entire Gulf and extend their political and military influence across Central Asia, from Uzbekistan to the Gulf and go into the Sinai, besides that they have a large military base at Incirlik in Turkey. Moreover, they struggle with both France and Britain over their influence in Africa. The British have a remnant of influence in both Asia and Africa, and a military presence in the Gulf and Gibraltar. The Serbs, Croats, Greeks, Romanians and Bulgarians occupy Islamic lands. Spain occupies Andalusia, Sabta and Maleela. The Italians occupy Sicily, the land of Al-Aghaliba. The islands of the Mediterranean sea are all

occupied and they are Islamic lands. The Philippines occupies Islamic lands and Burma does likewise. The Jewish state occupies Palestine, which is part of the frontiers of Bilad Ash-Sham. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said the truth when he said;

((يوشك أن تداعى عليكم الأمم كما تداعى الأكلة إلى قصعتها
فقال قائل : ومن قلة نحن يومئذ ؟ قال بل أنتم يومئذ كثير
ولكنكم غثاء كغثاء السيل وليترعن الله من صدور عدوكم
المهابة منكم وليقذفن الله في قلوبكم الوهن فقال قائل يا رسول
الله وما الوهن قال حب الدنيا وكراهية الموت))

"'The nations are on the verge of summoning each other over you, as the eaters summon each other over their large bowl.' So a speaker said; 'Is it because of our small number on that day?' He said; 'No, rather that day you will be many, but you will be foam like the foam of the torrent. Allah will remove from the chests of your enemies the fear from you and Allah will cast *al-wahan* in your hearts.' A speaker said; 'O Messenger of Allah, what is *al-wahan*?' He said; 'Loving the world and the fear of death.'" [narrated by Abu Dawud from Thawban]

Despite this painful reality, which is sufficient as a proof of the *kafir* civilisations' followers struggle with the Muslims, there is no reason why we shouldn't confirm this idea with the sayings of some of their politicians and thinkers ie from the *kufr* civilisations' followers.

- Nixon says in his book, 'Victory without War'; "Real peace is not an end to conflict but a means to living with conflict. Once established, it requires constant attention to survive. Americans are idealists, and idealists long for a world without conflict, a world in which all difference between nations have been overcome, all ambitions foresworn, all aggressive or selfish impulses transformed into acts of individual and national beneficence. But conflict is intrinsic to mankind. History, ideas and material aspirations have always divided the people of the world,

and these divisions have continually led to conflict and war. That will not change. We must accept the permanence of conflict and devise policies that take immutable fact of international life into account. We must not vainly search for perfect peace but turn our efforts to creating real peace. Perfect peace assumes the end of conflict. Real peace is a means of living with unending conflict. Real peace is a process – a continuing process for managing and containing conflict between competing nations, competing systems, and competing international ambitions. It is the only kind of peace that has ever existed and the only kind we can realistically hope to achieve." Nixon also says in, 'Seize the Moment'; "The interest is vital when its loss threatens the security of the United States. Thus the continuous independence of western Europe, Japan, Canada, Mexico and the Gulf states is a vital issue for our country's security. Likewise, we have a vital interest in that the under-developed countries do not obtain nuclear weapons. The US has no choice except using the armed forces to prevent the threat to its interests… To secure our top priority among these values, the survival of threatened democratic states such as Israel and South Korea, we should be prepared to employ military force if necessary."

On 21/01/1980 Carter delivered a 'State of the Union' address to the American Congress, and some of what he said was; "Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force."

- On 2/11/1990 Henry Kissinger published an article in the Yediot Aharanot newspaper under the heading; 'Soon, America, You will Lose Deterrent Force'. He said; "The military option is without doubt painful and difficult. It can incite demonstrations in Islamic countries and release the spark of new waves of terrorism. However, these dangers must be compared against the dangers of a more difficult conflict at a later time if the signs of American weakness lead to the collapse of moderate governments in the region, escalating the tension and the end of all systems."

- On 18/9/2001 in the (Amerikatan) newspaper on the internet was published an interview with the French newspaper *Le Figaro* conducted

with James Schlesinger, Nixon's advisor and former American defence secretary who currently works in the Centre for Strategic and International Studies. He said; "Uprooting these networks requires many years because they enjoy a strong determination resulting from their strong belief in their position."

- On the programme 'First War of the Century' on *Al-Jazeera* the presenter of the programme quoted from the Washington Post that Henry Kissinger said under the title 'Revenge is not Sufficient Response'; "It is necessary to face what happened with an attack against the system that produced this threat."

- The former Secretary General of the NATO alliance, Willy Claes, formally announced that the alliance endorsed Islam in the place of the former Soviet Union, as a target for its enmity. BBCOnline.net quoted from President Bush on 17/9/2001 his saying; "This crusade, this war on terrorism, is going to take a long time."

- Samuel Huntingdon says in his article in the American magazine 'Foreign Affairs'; "This centuries-old military interaction between the West and Islam is unlikely to decline. It could become more virulent."

- Shimon Peres said in his book 'The New Middle East'; "…we are a determined people and there is no power on the face of the earth able to induce us to abandon this land after fifty generations of living in the Diaspora, fifty generations of suppression, torment and annihilation. We will never move from the only place in this world, in which we are able to renew our independence, guarantee our safety and live with dignity and honour…"

- Steve Dunleavy said in the New York Post after the incident of Tuesday [September 11th]; "Kill the bastards! Train assassins, hire mercenaries, put a couple of million bucks up for bounty hunters to get them dead or alive, preferably dead. As for cities or countries that host these worms, bomb them into basketball courts."

THE PROBABLE EVIDENCES OF THOSE WHO DENY CIVILISATION STRUGGLE IN ISLAM

Even though these are their actions and sayings and they are both in harmony with one another, the deluded people, and some naïve Muslims, insist on having dialogue with them and deny the clash and struggle between civilisations exists. Some of this Ummah persist in having dialogue between religions, and target Christianity with this dialogue, and look for points of reconciliation between Islam and Christianity such as fighting against atheism; all the while forgetting - or pretending to forget - that all *kufr* is a singular creed;

﴿لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ﴾

"To you is your deen." [TMQ 109: 6] This is because Allah *subhanahu* addressed the disbelievers with the language of plurality and said;

﴿قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

"Say; O you disbelievers [plural]*."* [TMQ 109: 1] Then He mentioned the *deen* in singular form and said;

﴿لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ﴾

"To you is your deen [singular]*."* [TMQ 109: 6] Similarly they have meetings to solve the Palestinian problem. Yet who is it that created the Jewish state, protected it and assisted it with money, weapons and support, other than the *kafir* states which are founded upon the capitalist civilisation? The deluded have a duty to discharge, because they are the intellectual agents. As for the naïve, they are engaged in nothing but idle play and are occupying themselves with something futile; they share in deluding the masses. They enter into meetings, dialogue and discussions, which they are invited to by Jews and Christians. These invitations are suspicious calls, whose callers intend to detach us from our *deen*, and intend to mix the truth with falsehood, without sparing any effort in doing so;

﴿وَلَن تَرْضَى عَنكَ الْيَهُودُ وَلاَ النَّصَارَى حَتَّى تَتَّبِعَ مِلَّتَهُمْ قُلْ إِنَّ

هُدَى اللّهِ هُوَ الْهُدَى وَلَئِنِ اتَّبَعْتَ أَهْوَاءهُم بَعْدَ الَّذِي جَاءكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللّهِ مِن وَلِيٍّ وَلاَ نَصِيرٍ﴾

"Never will the Jews and Christians be pleased with you until you follow their creed. Say; verily the guidance of Allah is the (only) guidance. And if you were to follow their desires after what came to you of knowledge, then you would have against Allah no protector or helper." [TMQ 2: 120] He ﷻ also says;

﴿وَدُّوا لَوْ تُدْهِنُ فَيُدْهِنُونَ﴾

"They wish that you compromise (with them) so that they compromise (with you)" [TMQ 68: 9] ie incline to them. Even though this *ayah* was revealed about the Makkan polytheists, it applies upon every disbeliever (*kafir)* and polytheist. The definite *aayaat* and consensus (*ijmaa*) of the Sahabah prove, and the Islamic Ummah knows, that the People of the Book are disbelievers. So it is not possible to compromise with them, nor to incline towards them. Rather, it is obligatory to demonstrate the fallacy of their *deen*, their disbelief and their lies, and to invite them to enter the true *deen*; the *deen* of Islam. After establishing the Khilafah State, they are invited to Islam. If they reject that, then they pay the *Jizyah*. If they reject that also, then they face the sword. It is just a deception to take out from His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَلَا تُجَادِلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْهُمْ وَقُولُوا آمَنَّا بِالَّذِي أُنزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَأُنزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَإِلَهُنَا وَإِلَهُكُمْ وَاحِدٌ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ﴾

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with that which is better…" [TMQ 29:46] whilst remaining silent about the *ayah*'s conclusion; *"…except those who do wrong among them. And say; we believe in that which was revealed to us and revealed to you, our God and your God is one, and we submit (in Islam) to Him."* [TMQ 29:46] So those who do wrong among them [the People of the Book] are separate from the ones with whom we argue with what is better; the wrongdoers are the ones who fight and do not pay the *Jizyah*.

So what is required is to defeat them; not arguing with them.

Similarly it is incorrect to deduce the meaning, "peaceful co-existence between us and them", from His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَقُل لِّلَّذِينَ لاَ يُؤْمِنُونَ اعْمَلُواْ عَلَى مَكَانَتِكُمْ إِنَّا عَامِلُونَ وَانتَظِرُوا إِنَّا مُنتَظِرُونَ﴾

"And say to those who do not believe; act according to your ability, situation and way. We are acting (likewise). And wait! We (too) are waiting" [TMQ 11: 121-2], because this command indicates intimidation and threat. Rather, we are commanded beyond intimidating and threatening them; to fight them until they embrace Islam or pay the *Jizyah*, as we will discuss later. So where is the peaceful co-existence? As for deducing the concept, "leave the differences in beliefs and conduct between us and them to Allah to judge between us on the Day of Resurrection", from His ﷻ saying;

﴿إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا وَالصَّابِئِينَ وَالنَّصَارَى وَالْمَجُوسَ وَالَّذِينَ أَشْرَكُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَفْصِلُ بَيْنَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ﴾

"Verily those who believe and the Jews and Sabians and Christians and Zoroastrians, and those who associate (with Allah), verily Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection. Verily Allah is witness over all things" [TMQ 22:17]; if this means not compelling them to enter Islam, then it is correct. If it means that Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection, then that is also correct. If it means not inviting them to the *deen* of truth, then it is false. This is because we are commanded to carry the da'wah to them until they either; embrace Islam, pay the *Jizyah* or are fought. If it means not fighting them, this is also wrong. This is because the offensive war is *fard*, as we will discuss.

As for the deducing that these people deserve kindness, justice and good treatment, from His ﷻ saying;

﴿لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُم مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ أَن تَبَرُّوهُمْ وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ﴾

"Allah does not prohibit you to deal kindly and justly with regard to those who did not fight you over the deen nor drove you from your houses. Verily Allah loves those are just" [TMQ 60: 8]; it is outside the subject of the ayah. What is meant by this *ayah* is those who believed in Makkah and did not emigrate. So this deduction is wrong. If the meaning is every one of the people of [other] religions, the deduction is correct regarding those who did not fight us or drive us out from our homes. Definitely this does not include those who fight the Muslims of Palestine, expel them and assist in their expulsion. Also it does not include everyone who fights the Afghans now, expelling them and assisting in their expulsion. Likewise, it does not include any of the people fighting us in Iraq since the second Gulf War. Neither does it includes those fighting us in Kashmir, Chechnya and their like.

If they use His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَإِن جَنَحُواْ لِلسَّلْمِ فَاجْنَحْ لَهَا﴾

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ 8: 61], to say that Islam is a *deen* of peace and that peace is its origin, then this *ayah* has to be understood together with this *ayah*;

﴿فَلَا تَهِنُوا وَتَدْعُوا إِلَى السَّلْمِ وَأَنتُمُ الْأَعْلَوْنَ﴾

"Be not weak and call to peace while you have the upper hand." [TMQ 47: 35] So if Muslims are living with dignity, strength, power and as one *jama'ah*, then there is no peace. The evaluation of the benefit, or otherwise, of peace is left to the Khaleefah, and there is no importance given to the evaluation of anyone else unless he is delegated by the Khaleefah.

If they bring His ﷻ saying;

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُواْ ادْخُلُواْ فِي السِّلْمِ كَآفَّةً وَلاَ تَتَّبِعُواْ خُطُوَاتِ

الشَّيْطَانِ إِنَّهُ لَكُمْ عَدُوٌّ مُّبِينٌ﴾

"O you who believe, enter into submission (as-silm) completely and do not follow the footsteps of Satan. Verily he is an open enemy to you." [TMQ 2: 208], as an evidence it is necessary to know those being addressed with this *ayah*, and then to know the meaning of "*as-silm*". "*Those who believe*", could mean the Muslims are being addressed, and it could be the believers in Prophets before Muhammad. "*As-silm*", could be Islam or it could mean peace. If the ones who are addressed are those who believe in Muhammad ﷺ, there is no meaning in saying to them; 'Enter into peace with believers', because they are not warriors against us, rather they are also believers. It is only said to them; 'Enter completely into Islam - meaning the obedience to all His *Shari'ah* and establishing His limits and rules - without trying to take some and leave some'. If those who are addressed are the believers in the previous Prophets, there is no meaning in requesting them to enter into peace; rather this meaning does not exist in the Qur'an. At-Tabari said; "As for calling them initially to peace, this does not exist in the Qur'an." So the meaning is calling them to enter Islam. So regardless of whoever was addressed, there is no call in the *ayah* for Muslims to enter into a treaty of peace with disbelievers ie mutual peace.

If they bring His ﷻ saying;

﴿فَإِنِ اعْتَزَلُوكُمْ فَلَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ وَأَلْقَوْاْ إِلَيْكُمُ السَّلَمَ فَمَا جَعَلَ اللّهُ لَكُمْ عَلَيْهِمْ سَبِيلاً﴾

"And if they withdraw from you, fight not against you and offer you peace, then Allah has opened no way for you against them" [TMQ 4: 90], as an evidence to say that it is *haram* for Muslims to initiate fighting against peaceful disbelievers who hold-back from fighting Muslims. Then it is said that this *ayah* relates to hypocrites who reach and befriend a people with whom we have a covenant ie they follow their rule in the treaty. It might mean those who go out with them under compulsion to fight us and then withdraw from the fighting, like those who came out on the day of Badr with the polytheists; there is no place for us to be against those people.

If they bring His ﷻ saying;

﴿أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظُلِمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ﴾

"Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought, because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is Able to support them" [TMQ 22: 39], as an evidence to say that the permission to fight is for the oppressed against whoever initiated fighting against him. Then it is said that the command to fight is absolute (*mutlaq*) without restriction to the situation of oppression. This is because His ﷻ saying, "*because they were oppressed*" is not a divine reason (*'illah*) for fighting, but rather a descriptive reality. This is because the Quraysh used to severely harm the Muslims who would come to Rasool Allah ﷺ beaten and wounded in the head. They complained to him and he said to them;

((أصبروا فإني لم أومر بالقتال))

"Be patient for I have not been commanded with fighting", until they emigrated. Then this *ayah* was revealed where Allah commanded them with fighting after He had forbidden them from engaging in it. Ad-Dhahak said; "The companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ sought permission to fight the disbelievers when they harmed them, and Allah revealed;

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ كُلَّ خَوَّانٍ كَفُورٍ﴾

'Verily Allah likes not any treacherous disbeliever.' [TMQ 22: 38] When he emigrated, it was revealed;

﴿أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظُلِمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ﴾

'Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is Able to support them.' [TMQ 22: 39]" Thus the *ayah* was revealed to lift the ban that was on the Muslims repelling harm from themselves. So it is a specific situation, even if it avails the command to fight via the indicated meaning (*dalalat al-ishara*). So the *ayah* does not explain the legitimacy of fighting in the way of Allah, but the legitimacy of fighting to repel harm. Thus there is no contradiction between this *ayah* and the *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah*. Moreover, the *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah* were revealed later, so there is no abrogation, specification or restriction applicable to them

If they bring the hadith of ibn Abi Awfa that is agreed upon; **"The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said;**

((أيها الناس لا تتمنوا لقاء العدو وسلوا الله العافية فإذا لقيتموهم فاصبروا واعلموا أن الجنة تحت ظلال السيوف))

'O people, do not wish to meet the enemy and ask Allah for well-being. And if you meet them, be patient and know that Paradise is under the shadow of swords'", [as an evidence for mutual peace]. Then it is said that this hadith has no relation with mutual peace, since what it indicates is that one should not wish to meet them; not that fighting them is prohibited, or that the command is to make peace with them. The scholars have said this prohibition is because there is pride in wishing to meet the enemy. So any deduction other than this is out of context. There are other attempts to deduce ideas from the texts that don't even deserve rebuttal; in fact they are not even worth mentioning. However we mention them to prove that some of these people do not refrain from gathering evidences in any way possible. Their main concern is to prove Islam is a *deen* of peace and not a *deen* of struggle, conflict and jihad. Rather, in their view it is a *deen* of security, peace and tolerance. One of the things they claim is an evidence for this is His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَآمَنَهُم مِّنْ خَوْفٍ﴾

"And made them safe from fear." [TMQ 106: 4] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿أَوَلَمْ يَرَوْا أَنَّا جَعَلْنَا حَرَماً آمِناً وَيُتَخَطَّفُ﴾

"…a secure sanctuary." [TMQ 29: 67] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَهَذَا الْبَلَدِ الْأَمِينِ﴾

"And by this city of security." [TMQ 95: 3] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُم مِّن بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ﴾

"And We will exchange for them security after their fear." [TMQ 24: 55] And his ﷺ saying;

((من أصبح منكم آمناً في سربه))

"Whoever of you awakes safe in his flock (*sirb*)." Indeed, this is ridiculing the *Shar'a* and insulting the minds of the people!

8

Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those denying the Offensive Jihad (Jihad ut-Talab)

Those saying Islam is a *deen* of peace deny offensive jihad ie initiating the fight against the disbelievers. They confirm the existence of defensive war and deny the existence of offensive war. Some of them believe there is no necessity for this [offensive war] since it is possible to overcome the material obstacles and convey the da'wah to disbelievers - without colliding with these obstacles - by using the internet, media, books, and leaflets, and by building mosques and Islamic centres in the heart of the disbelievers' countries, and by having one-on-one contact with individuals to make them enter the *deen* of Allah. They claim that this takes the place of offensive war. This view is in absolute conflict with the texts of the Book, *Sunnah* and *Ijmaa as-Sahabah*, which all command that we initiate the fight against them - even if they do not initiate it against us - if they do not accept Islam or pay the *Jizyah* and submit to the rule of Islam. These texts are do not carry the reasoning (*illah*) that; "jihad is only obliged in the situation of inability to convey verbally".

As for the Book, it contains His ﷻ saying;

﴿قَاتِلُواْ الَّذِينَ لاَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللّهِ وَلاَ بِالْيَوْمِ الآخِرِ وَلاَ يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلاَ يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُواْ الْكِتَابَ حَتَّى يُعْطُواْ الْجِزْيَةَ عَن يَدٍ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ﴾

"Fight those who do not believe in Allah nor the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid nor follow the deen of the People of the Book until they pay Jizyah readily and they are humbled." [TMQ 9: 29] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَقَاتِلُواْ الْمُشْرِكِينَ كَآفَّةً كَمَا يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ كَآفَّةً وَاعْلَمُواْ أَنَّ اللّهَ

مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ﴾

"Fight the polytheists collectively as they fight you collectively. And remember that Allah is with the pious." [TMQ 9: 36] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفَّارَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ وَاغْلُظْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَمَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ وَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيرُ﴾

"O Prophet, fight the disbelievers and hypocrites and be harsh against them. Their abode is Hellfire, a wretched destination!" [TMQ 9: 73] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿إِنَّ اللّهَ اشْتَرَى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُم بِأَنَّ لَهُمُ الجَنَّةَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللّهِ فَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيُقْتَلُونَ وَعْداً عَلَيْهِ حَقّاً فِي التَّوْرَاةِ وَالإِنجِيلِ وَالْقُرْآنِ وَمَنْ أَوْفَى بِعَهْدِهِ مِنَ اللّهِ فَاسْتَبْشِرُواْ بِبَيْعِكُمُ الَّذِي بَايَعْتُم بِهِ وَذَلِكَ هُوَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ﴾

"Verily Allah purchased from the believers their souls and property so that Paradise is for them. They fight in the way of Allah, they kill and are killed. A promise binding upon Him in the Torah, Bible and Qur'an, and who is truer to his covenant than Allah? Then rejoice in the bargain that you have concluded. And that is the supreme success." [TMQ 9: 111] And His ﷻ saying;

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُواْ قَاتِلُواْ الَّذِينَ يَلُونَكُم مِّنَ الْكُفَّارِ وَلْيَجِدُواْ فِيكُمْ غِلْظَةً وَاعْلَمُواْ أَنَّ اللّهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ﴾

"O you who believe, fight those are close to you among the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you. And know that Allah is with the pious." [TMQ 9: 123] These are *aayaat* from *At-Tawbah*, which is among the last [*suwar*] to be revealed, without anything coming to specify, restrict or abrogate it. So it is evidence for jihad encompassing defensive and offensive war. As for His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَإِن جَنَحُواْ لِلسَّلْمِ فَاجْنَحْ لَهَا﴾

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ 8: 61], and His ﷻ saying;

﴿وَقَاتِلُواْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلاَ تَعْتَدُواْ إِنَّ اللّهَ لاَ يُحِبِّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ﴾

"Fight in the way of Allah those fighting you and do not transgress. Verily Allah loves not the transgressors" [TMQ 2: 190], and His ﷻ saying;

﴿أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظُلِمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ﴾

"Permission (to fight) has been given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. Verily Allah is Able to support them." [TMQ 22: 39] These *aayaat* and their like are not suitable to specify the generality of the *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah*, or to restrict those which are unrestricted (*mutlaq*) because they were all revealed before the *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah*, and the precedent text does not specify or restrict the later text. This is because specification is equivalent to abrogation of a part of the general text as it diverts the rule from its generality, by invalidating it in part and putting another rule in its place. As long as specification is equivalent to abrogation - and it is part of abrogation that the abrogator (*nasikh*) came after the abrogated (*mansukh*) - then these *aayaat* are not suitable to specify the *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah* because they were revealed before it. The *aayaat* of *At-Tawbah* are among the last of what was revealed concerning jihad, so specification does not occur. What has been said about specification also applies to restriction. It is necessary for the restricting text to have come after the unrestricted text - or to accompany it - for it to act as a restriction, or for the unrestricted text to be applied upon the restricted. Therefore, the general remains general because of the absence of any specifying text to specify it. And the absolute remains unrestricted because of the absence of any restricting text that the unrestricted can be restricted with it or applied on it.

As for the *Sunnah* [being an evidence in this matter], this is because of what the two Sheikhs reported from the hadith of 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar who said;

((أمرت أن أقاتل النس حتى يشهدوا أن لا إله إلا الله وأن
محمدا رسول الله ويقيموا الصلاة ويؤتوا الزكاة فإن فعلوا ذلك
عصموا منى دماءهم إلا بحقها وحسابهم على الله تعال))

"The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: "I was commanded to fight the people until they bear witness that '*La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad Rasul-Allah*', establish the prayer and pay the zakat. If they do that, they safeguard their blood from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." And in another narration;

((أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا لا إله الله فإذا قالوها فقد
عصموا منى دماءهم وأموالهم إلى بحقها وحسابهم على الله))

"I was commanded to fight the people until they say *La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad Rasul-Allah*. If they say that, they safeguard their blood and property from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." There is also what Muslim reported from Sulayman ibn Buraydah from his father;

((كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا أمر إميرا على جيش
أو سرية في خاصته بتقوى الله ومن معه من المسلمين خيرا ثم
قال : اغزوا باسم الله في سبيل الله ، قاتلوا من كفر بالله ،
اغزوا ولا تعلوا ، ولا تغدروا ولا تمثلوا ، ولا تقتلوا وليدا ،
وإذا لقيت عدوك من المشركين فادعهم إلى ثلاث خصال أو
خلال فأيتهن ما أجابوك فاقبل منهم وكف عنهم ، ثم ادعهم
إلى الإسلام فإن أجابوك فاقبل منهم وكف عنهم ، ثم اجعهم
لى التحول من دار المهاجرين وخبرهم أنهم إن فعلوا ذلك فلهم

مالمهاجرين وعليهم ما على المهاجرين ، فإن أبوا أن يحولوا
منها فأخبرهم أنهم يكونون كأعراب المسلمين يجري عليهم
حكم الله الذي يجري على المؤمنين ولا يكون لهم الغنيمة والفئ
شئ إلا أن يجاهدوا مع المسلمين، فإن هم أبوا فسلهم الجزية ،
فإن هم أجابوك منهم وكف عنهم ، فإن هم أبوا فاستعن بالله
عليهم وقاتلهم))

"When the Messenger ﷺ would command an Amir over an army or expedition, he advised him to fear Allah in himself and goodness for the Muslims with him. Then he would say; 'Attack in the name of Allah, in the way of Allah. Attack and do not misappropriate (from the booty), betray, mutilate or kill children. When you meet your enemy, invite them to three matters (*khisal*) or (*khilal*), so whichever they respond to, accept from them and desist from (fighting) them. Invite them to Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from them. Then call them to move from their homeland to the homeland of the Muhajireen. Inform them that if they do that, then for them (in rights) is what is for the Muhajireen, and against them (in duties) is what is against the Muhajireen. If they refuse to move, inform them that they are like the bedouin Muslims; the rule of Allah that applies upon the believers applies upon them but there is no spoils of war or booty for them except if they fight together with the Muslims. If they refuse, ask them for the *Jizyah*; if they respond to you, accept from them and desist from them. If they refuse, seek assistance in Allah against them and fight them.'"

These two hadith are explicit in stating that jihad is initiating the fight. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ initiated fighting the Hawazin at Hunayn, the Thaqif at Taif, and the Byzantine Romans in Mu'tah and Tabuk. And he went forth to fight twenty seven *ghazwat* (battles led by the Messenger) in nine years. This is aside from the expeditions led by the companions.

As for the *Ijma'a as-Sahabah* that proves jihad is fighting in the way of Allah to spread Islam - and that it includes the initiation of the fighting; the conquests of Iraq, Persia, Ash-Sham, Egypt, North Africa, Khurasan, Kabul and Sijistan amongst others, are sufficient to prove it [the existence of the *ijma'a*]. The Copts of Egypt did not attack the Muslims, and the Berbers and Dailaam, did not attack them either. All of these countries were conquered at the time of the *Sahabah*; the *Sahabah* initiated the fighting against them and conquered these lands. After all that, is there room for saying that jihad is only defensive war and that there is no offensive war in Islam?

9
Conclusion

In brief, the clash of civilisations is an inevitable matter. It existed in the past, exists now and it will remain until the clash ends shortly before the [Final] Hour; since it does not come except upon the worst of creation. Do not be deceived, O Muslims, by the callers to dialogue, who place their heads in the sand and condone humiliation and defeat. Make the preparations required for the conflict, since the capitalist western civilisation has knocked you down militarily, politically and economically; however they will never defeat you intellectually. Your *'aqeedah* is hard to defeat; and it remains alive in the souls of men; it is only that some concepts from your civilisation coming out from your *'aqeedah* have been contaminated and have become sullied by dust. So work to purify those concepts and shake off the dust from them by returning to the Book and the *Sunnah*. Beware of accepting a saying without evidence, or accepting something with evidence from one who is not a *mujtahid* - or from the one who is reporting from him. This is the time of ignorant leaders, who give *fatawa* without knowledge. So beware of them, and search for the sincere active scholars, and take your *deen* from them; they are the lamps in the darkness, and they are only a few. Know that the ultimate triumph and victory is for Islam and Muslims. This is what Allah and His Messenger promised us in definite reports, so be confident in the good promise of Allah. Work to appoint your Khaleefah, and establish over your *jama'ah* one man from among you, so he makes preparations, unifies the Ummah, terrifies the enemy, protects the territories, deals with the citizens justly, and distributes equally, and so Allah makes this *deen* dominant over all other *deen*s at his hands, even if the polytheists detest it.

O Allah, guide the Ummah of Muhammad to that which pleases You and make it deserve Your support. O Most Merciful, we are weak at Your door, appealing for Your help and seeking Your protection, dedicated in utter submission to You, desperate for Your help. Support

Your *deen*, fulfil Your promise, and bring down Your Victory. For You is the praise in every situation.